



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 14, 2002

No. 61

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

Washington, DC, May 14, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for 5 minutes.

STATES NEED FLEXIBILITY IN WELFARE REFORM

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, we have passed welfare reform out of this body; and as a result, we are putting more people to work. Welfare rolls have been cut in half in many States. With these successes in mind, now is the time to look at what is working and what is not.

One of the biggest problems is how reform is impacting the rural areas of America. In rural America, where there are not many job opportunities, we are telling people to leave their homes and

move to the city. In rural New Mexico, many people have been tied to the land and their homes for generations. Forcing people to move is not good public policy, and it is undermining the vitality of rural America. The solution is flexibility for States to design their programs, and the solution is transportation. Transportation should be a key part of any welfare reform.

Another issue relates to the jobs people are filling. Is this the kind of employment where an individual can move up the economic ladder and support a family? Many times these are minimum-wage jobs with no real future. So we must provide meaningful job training so that an individual not only gets a job, but that that job opens the doors to better future opportunities.

Welfare recipients want to work, but they also want to take care of their children. This is the common dilemma faced by welfare parents, many of whom are single mothers with children. The last thing we should do in the name of reform is send parents to work and leave the children without adequate nurturing and care. That is why child care is a critical component of a successful welfare reform effort.

If we have learned anything in this reform effort, it is that States should have the flexibility to meet the goals of putting people to work in good jobs, while children get good quality day-care. Inner cities and rural areas face enormous challenges because frequently jobs do not exist nearby. With flexibility, States have been able to achieve big strides. Without flexibility, States will fail in these important tasks.

Unfortunately, the administration bill that the House is going to consider this week fails to recognize why we have made progress. It undercuts the flexibility of the States. It provides for rigid Federal mandates which are good political talking points, but bad public

policy. The Bush administration also fails to recognize we are in different times. In 1995 the economy was expanding. We had unprecedented job growth. Now we have high unemployment, and it is sluggish growth. It is essential that the States receive adequate resources to do the job.

The administration shortchanges these reforms at a time when State budgets are in deficit. The administration bill imposes massive new mandates and additional costs on States that cannot be met. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated the new work requirements in the bill will cost the States up to \$11 billion over 5 years. Yet this bill contains no new funding.

Governors, State legislators, mayors, welfare directors and poverty experts have all indicated that these mandates cannot be met. Forty-seven out of 47 States surveyed by the National Governor's Association indicated that the bill requires fundamental changes in their welfare programs. Why would an administration which supports States rights craft a bill with so many Federal mandates and so little State flexibility?

Just a word on how we deal with these bills. I would urge the Republican leadership to have a full and open debate on the issue of welfare reform and temporary assistance to needy families. Too many times in recent days we have taken up bills where no amendments are allowed by the minority. Many times no opposition bill is even allowed on the floor, or a motion to recommit. That is not a democratic process. It does not serve this body well. It does not serve the country well.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Republican leadership to bring this bill before this body under an open rule, allow full debate, and allow the House to work its will.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2391

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, this week we have an important piece of legislation which is coming to the floor, a product of the Committee on Ways and Means, legislation which is entitled H.R. 4626, Encouraging Work and Supporting Marriage Act of 2002. Essentially this legislation does two things: it expands and reforms the work opportunity tax credit, a hiring incentive to give those on welfare an opportunity to go to work.

Yesterday, I stood with President Bush in Chicago at the United Parcel Service facility where he highlighted this very program which has provided opportunities for thousands and thousands of Chicago residents to go from welfare to work; and clearly the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, which was a creation of Ronald Reagan, is one of those provisions which is working as we see our Nation's welfare rolls cut in half and 9 million Americans move from welfare to work.

The other key part of the Encouraging Work and Supporting Marriage Act of 2002 is legislation which much more quickly phases in the marriage tax relief provisions which are part of what we nicknamed the Bush tax cut signing into law last year.

Over the last several years, I have had the opportunity to come to this floor and talk about the unfairness of our complicated Tax Code and how our current Tax Code historically has punished marriage, a very basic institution in our society. In fact, I believe the most important institution in our society is marriage. Unfortunately, up until President Bush's signature signing the Bush tax cut into law, our Tax Code punished marriage.

Let me give an example of what the marriage tax penalty is and was. Under our Tax Code prior to the Bush tax cut, 43 million married working couples paid on average \$1,700 more in higher taxes just because they were married. I do not believe that is right; I do not believe that is fair. And I am proud to say that House Republicans made it a priority to work with the President to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

I would also note what creates the marriage tax penalty is married couples file their taxes jointly. A single person files single and married couples file jointly, which means there is a combined income. If there are two incomes, that pushes the couple into a higher tax bracket and in most cases creates the marriage tax penalty.

I have a couple here from my district I would like to introduce, Jose and Magdalena Castillo from Joliet, Illinois. They are both in the workforce. They have a son, Eduardo, as well as a daughter, Carolina. They paid about \$1,200 in higher taxes just because they are married prior to the Bush tax cut.

I think it is wrong. Thanks to the Bush tax cut, Jose and Magdalena Castillo of Joliet, Illinois, saw their marriage tax penalty eliminated. Of course, we are going to have legislation this week which is going to help low- and moderate-income married couples. It will more quickly phase in so married couples in the low- and moderate-income range will see much quicker marriage tax relief.

But I would also note, unfortunately because of the arcane rules of Congress, not of the House but of the other body, that the Bush tax cut was forced to be temporary which means it expires at a certain point; and the 100 million American taxpayers who have seen their taxes lowered, which is everybody who pays income taxes has seen their income taxes lowered, and 3.9 million families with children have been totally removed from the income tax rolls, which means thanks to the Bush tax cut, they no longer pay income taxes, they will see those taxes reimposed unless we make permanent the Bush tax cut.

Now for couples like Jose and Magdalena Castillo of Joliet, Illinois, they are going to see their marriage tax penalty reimposed; and they will be suffering it once again unless we make the Bush tax cut permanent.

I am proud to say that this House under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the persistence and convictions of the House Republican majority, we have voted in the House to make the Bush tax cut permanent because we do not want to see couples such as Jose and Magdalena Castillo of Joliet, Illinois, have to pay that marriage tax penalty again. It is wrong; it is unfair. And it is wrong that under our Tax Code, married couples paid higher taxes just because they are married.

My hope is before the end of this year that we will be able to obtain bipartisan support in both the House and Senate for adoption of a permanency for the Bush tax cut, for marriage tax penalty relief, for elimination of the death tax, for across-the-board rate reductions, for retirement savings as well as the opportunities to save for college education.

Those are good things; but unfortunately, they are temporary. Unless we make the Bush tax cut permanent, all of those things, marriage tax penalty relief, death tax repeal, retirement savings opportunities by increased contributions to IRAs and 401(k)s, an opportunity to see taxes lowered overall because of rate reductions for everyone, those taxes are going to go back up. Let us make the Bush tax cut permanent. Let us help couples such as Jose and Magdalena Castillo see their marriage tax penalty eliminated permanently. Let us get the Senate and the House to make the Bush tax cut permanent.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PENCE) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord of history and source of benevolent providence, You know the times and govern the seasons of life; help Your servants who work in the House of Representatives to seize the opportunity of the present moment and give You glory.

As Members assemble today, may they be encouragement to one another. May those who are dealing with illness or the great loss of a loved one be consoled. Assure them, by Your spirit, that You are with them in their every need.

Enable the people of this Nation to seek lasting values that will bind this country together and bring eternal joy to a changing world. In their desire to accomplish Your holy will, make them one in mind and heart, that leadership may be honored and the diverse peoples of this Nation may live in harmony and take sheer delight in Your presence, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAMPSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

OVERDUE BOOKS AND CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I read in the paper recently about a woman from Hazelton, Pennsylvania, who was thrown in jail because she had three overdue library books. Theresa Keller's husband used her library card to check out three library books 2 years ago and never returned them. Well, not long afterwards, Mrs. Keller found herself living in a domestic violence shelter. She did not even know about the books. Nevertheless, the judge through her in jail for several days for failing to pay her library fines.

Now, while all of this was happening, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that virtual child pornography was legal. It seems the Supreme Court thinks that everyone has a constitutional right to child pornography on the computer. So my question is this: How is it that the American judicial system is throwing women in jail for overdue library books but at the same time telling pornographers that they are free to continue to make child pornography on computers?

Mr. Speaker, something is very wrong here.

CHILD ONLINE PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, again I digress from my story of Ludwig Koonz who is in Italy and most anxious to return to the United States of America. I rise to congratulate the Supreme Court on its decision to partially uphold the Child Online Protection Act.

The 1998 law was designed to stop children from gaining access to sexual material on the Internet. As the founder and chair of the Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus, I am glad to see that the Supreme Court agreed with Congress that community standards protecting children should be applied to the World Wide Web.

We have seen an attack lately on the laws designed to protect children from pornography and exploitation, and we all must work together to make sure that children remain protected. I urge Members to join the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) and me in our work to protect innocent children from the business of sex and pornography. Please support the Child Modeling Ex-

ploitation Act of 2002, which would ban exploitative child modeling, banning all Web sites that charge fees to view models 16 years of age and under that do not promote products or services beyond the child.

The children in these sites are in contact with the customers through e-mail and in some more extreme cases through actual meetings. They put children in great danger both psychological and physical.

I urge Members to join the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) and me and work to end this horrendous practice.

DON VONARX AND KEN WHITTAKER, STARS OF LIFE

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last week I had a wonderful opportunity to meet two exceptional emergency technicians from Reno, Nevada: Don Vonarx and Ken Whittaker.

These two Reno EMTs were recently granted the Stars of Life Award which is the highest honor given in their professional field. Don and Ken are tremendous examples of tenacious, compassionate, and remarkable individuals who have shown courage and leadership in their professional commitment.

Whether training hundreds of emergency care providers, deploying life-saving equipment to those in need, or designing speciality EMT classes for people of every age, these gentlemen have shown extraordinary success in helping to save lives throughout Nevada. Their success is reflected in both their accomplishments and especially in their professional and personal relationships with student and colleagues.

We are truly blessed to have both Don Vonarx and Ken Whittaker working as emergency medical technicians in my home town of Reno, and I am honored to know them both.

HONORING THE SUFFOLK COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome to Washington and into the people's House the brave men and women of the Suffolk County Police Department who join with us today as part of a national commemoration at the National Police Memorial. And I want to thank them for the heroic and dedicated work they do.

On September 11, my district on Long Island lost over 102 people in the World Trade Center attack. On September 11 we realized that we had heroes and heroines in our midst. It should not have taken September 11 for us to understand just how vitally important they are. We should celebrate

that every day. And I am glad that the men and women of the Suffolk County Police Department could join us on this day.

TRUTH IN DOMAIN NAMES ACT

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, the Internet can be a force for good or a force for evil. At its best the Web is used to disseminate information and provide educational materials to children. Teachers and parents often encourage children to turn to the Internet for research on school projects; but certain Web sites, Mr. Speaker, intentionally use misleading names to lead children into exposure to pornography.

Last week I sought to address this problem on the Internet with H.R. 4658, the Truth in Domain Names Act. The bill would punish those who use misleading domain names to attract children to pornographic Internet sites, who can be fined up to \$250,000 or face 2 years in prison.

The Good Book tells us that whoever causes one of the least of these little ones to sin ought to have a millstone tied around his neck. While we cannot legislate that retribution, Mr. Speaker, surely we can pass the Truth in Domain Names Act. It penalizes those who would lead children to view this prurient material. I urge my colleagues in this institution to join many of us on both sides of the aisle to support the Truth in Domain Names Act.

ABOLISH NUCLEAR ARMS

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, seemingly when the United States and Russia would get together to announce an arms reduction treaty, that would be important news for the world. I think any time the United States and Russia sit down and talk about what can be done to eliminate nuclear weapons is an important moment. However, the announcement by President Bush and Vladimir Putin that they will sign a nuclear pact needs to be scrutinized very carefully.

If you read today's New York Times you see they say that "the proposed treaty sets no pace for dismantling weapons over the next decade, as long as the total number of strategic weapons does not exceed 2,200 in 2012. It permits the United States to stockpile the dismantled weapons in a form that would allow them to be reinstalled on missiles or aboard nuclear armed submarines in case of an ugly turn of events with any major nuclear power. In short, it is an agreement filled with escape clauses."

The only way that we can really protect the world against nuclear arms is

to work for complete nuclear abolition. That is something that this administration has taken a path away from. It has taken a path towards deconstructing the nonproliferation treaty towards building new nuclear weapons and towards nuclear proliferation. This treaty that has been described does not do anything to bring the world one step away from the abyss.

DISASTER RELIEF FOR MONTANA

(Mr. REHBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of American farmers and ranchers to ask this Congress to support disaster relief assistance this year.

Montana's farmers and ranchers are entering their fifth, and some cases their sixth, straight year of devastating drought conditions. When floods ravage the Southwest or when hurricanes touch down along the coastal regions of the United States, this Congress has acted forcefully and rightly to offer immediate and substantial financial assistance to those families and businesses most in need.

On behalf of producers of food in more than a dozen States suffering from the most severe disaster conditions in more than a generation, I ask this Congress to act with equal diligence to offer immediate assistance before it is finally too late.

HONORING THE NATIONAL GUARD

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in May we celebrate National Military Appreciation Month. This month we are reminded to actively honor and support all of our men and women in uniform who voluntarily risk their lives so we may achieve peace through strength.

I would like to give special recognition to America's oldest military branch, the National Guard, which has celebrated 365 years of service. As a son of a World War II veteran, myself a colonel in the South Carolina Army National Guard and with three sons in the military, I have seen the service the Guard provides in defense of America's homeland.

My colleagues are extraordinary people who train year-round and are ready at a moment's notice to leave their families and jobs to defend liberty. In South Carolina we are fortunate to have dedicated leadership with Adjutant General Stan Spears.

Most recently in the war against terrorism, over 50,000 Guardsmen and women have been called to duty. Today's National Guard continues its historic dual mission: protecting life and property within our borders while pro-

viding units trained, equipment, and ready to defend the United States and its interests all over the globe.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill on Friday, May 10, 2002:

H.R. 2646, to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.

□ 1415

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 10, 2002.

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 10, 2002 at 2:20 p.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1840.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. JOHN E. BALDACCI, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN E. BALDACCI, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2002.

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony and documents issued by the Penobscot County Superior Court, State of Maine.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House. Accordingly, I have instructed the Office of General Counsel to move to quash the subpoena.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. BALDACCI,
Member of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on

which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such record votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 6:30 p.m. today.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR ACT

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1370) to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide for maintenance and repair of buildings and properties located on lands in the National Wildlife Refuge System by lessees of such facilities, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1370

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LEASES, PERMITS, AND CONTRACTS FOR BUILDINGS, FACILITIES, AND PROPERTIES IN THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.) is amended by—

(1) striking section 6 (relating to amendments to other laws, which have executed);

(2) redesignating section 5 (16 U.S.C. 668ee) as section 6; and

(3) inserting after section 4 the following:

“SEC. 5. CONCESSION CONTRACTS.

“(a) CONTRACT REQUIREMENT.—(1) The Secretary shall not award any concession that authorizes a person to use any land or water in the System for any activity described in subsection (b), except under a contract that complies with the requirements established under subsection (c).

“(2) The Secretary may not award a contract required under this subsection except under a competitive bidding process.

“(b) COVERED CONCESSION ACTIVITIES.—(1) The activity referred to in subsection (a) is any activity conducted to provide accommodations, facilities, or services to members of the public who are visiting lands or waters in the System, for the purpose of providing such visitors recreational, educational, or interpretive enjoyment of lands or waters in the System.

“(2) Such activity does not include—

“(A) any activity carried out under a procurement contract, grant agreement, or cooperative agreement required under chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code;

“(B) the performance of volunteer services; and

“(C) any activity by a governmental entity.

“(c) STANDARDIZED CONTRACT.—(1) The Secretary, acting through the Director, shall issue regulations that establish a standardized contract for purposes of subsection (a).

“(2) Regulations under this subsection shall authorize a contract to use a provision other than those specified by the regulations only if—

“(A) the provision addresses extenuating circumstances that are specific to a refuge or the contract; and

“(B) the provision is approved by the Director in writing.

“(3) Regulations under this subsection shall require in each contract provisions

that require that any activity conducted in the System under the contract—

“(A) must be a compatible use; and

“(B) must be designed to—

“(i) conserve the natural and cultural resources of the System;

“(ii) facilitate the enjoyment of the lands and waters of the System by visitors to the System; and

“(iii) enhance the such visitors’ knowledge of the natural resources of the System.

“(d) MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall include, in each contract that authorizes a person to use any land or water in the System for any activity described in subsection (b), provisions that—

“(A) authorize the person to maintain or repair any improvement on or in such land or water that the person is authorized to use for such activity; and

“(B) treat costs incurred by the person for such maintenance or repair as consideration otherwise required to be paid to the United States for such use.

“(2) This subsection does not authorize any maintenance or repair that is not directly related to an activity described in subsection (b) that is authorized by the contract.

“(3) The United States shall retain title to all property that is maintained or repaired under this subsection.

“(e) NO COMPENSABLE INTEREST.—Nothing in this Act shall be considered to convey to any person any right to compensation for—

“(1) the value of any maintenance activities, repairs, construction, or improvements on or in land or water in the System; or

“(2) buildings, facilities, fixtures, and non-movable equipment that the person is authorized to use under this Act.

“(f) EXPENDITURE OF FEES AND OTHER PAYMENTS.—(1) Amounts received by the United States as fees or other payments required under any agreement, lease, permit, or contract for use of real property located in an area in the System shall be available to the Secretary for expenditure in accordance with this subsection, without further appropriation.

“(2) Amounts available for expenditure under this subsection may only be used—

“(A) at the refuge or refuge complex with respect to which the amounts were received as fees or other payments;

“(B) to increase the quality of the visitor experience; and

“(C) for purposes of—

“(i) backlogged repair and maintenance projects (including projects relating to health and safety);

“(ii) interpretation, signage, habitat, or facility enhancement;

“(iii) resource protection and preservation; or

“(iv) administration of agreements, leases, permits, and contracts from which such amounts are derived.

“(3) Paragraph (1) shall not affect the application of the Act of June 15, 1935 (chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s), commonly referred to as the Refuge Revenue Sharing Act, to amounts referred to in paragraph (1) that are not expended by the Secretary under paragraph (1).”

(b) APPLICATION.—Section 5(a) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended by this section, shall apply only with respect to a concession that is—

(1) first awarded after the date of the publication of regulations under section 5(c) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended by this section; or

(2) renewed after the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS ESTABLISHING STANDARDIZED CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall issue regulations under section 5(c) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended by this section, by not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 4(e) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) The Secretary shall include, in the comprehensive conservation plan for each refuge under this subsection, a description of the activities that may be conducted in the refuge, and the lands, waters, and facilities of the refuge that may be used, under concession contracts awarded under section 5(a).”

(e) PRIOR AMENDMENTS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any amendment made by section 6 of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as in effect before the enactment of this Act, or any provision of law amended by such section.

(f) ANNUAL REPORT ON NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE CONCESSIONS.—

(1) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following: “SEC. 7. ANNUAL REPORT ON CONCESSION ACTIVITIES IN THE SYSTEM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit by December 31 each year, to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, a report on concessions activities conducted in the System.

“(b) CONTENTS.—Each report under this section shall describe the following with respect to the period covered by the report:

“(1) The number of refuge units in which concessions activities were conducted.

“(2) The names and descriptions of services offered in the System by each concessionaire.

“(3) A listing of the different types of legal arrangements under which concessionaires operated in the System, including contracts, memoranda of understanding, permits, letters of agreement, and other arrangements.

“(4) Amounts of fees or other payments received by the United States with respect to such activities from each concessionaire, and the portion of such funds expended for purposes under this Act.

“(5) An accounting of the amount of monies deposited into the fund established by section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s), popularly known as the refuge revenue sharing fund, and of the balance remaining in the fund at the end of the reporting period.

“(6) A listing of all concession contracts and other arrangements that were terminated or not renewed within the reporting period.

“(7) A summary of all improvements in visitor services in the System that were completed by concessionaires and volunteers during the reporting period.

“(8) A summary of all backlogged repair and maintenance, facility enhancement, and resource preservation projects completed by concessionaires and volunteers during the reporting period.”

(2) DEADLINE FOR FIRST REPORT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall submit the first report under the amendment made by paragraph (1) by not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from In-

diana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

President Theodore Roosevelt fostered a conservation legacy when in 1903 he established the first national wildlife refuge, the Pelican Island National Wildlife Refuge. It was the first time the Federal Government set aside land just for the sake of wildlife. It has now become the National Wildlife Refuge System and includes more than 530 refuges and thousands of waterfowl production areas.

Americans have a passion for their land, and national wildlife refuges embody this unique American tradition of public land protection and stewardship. By visiting and supporting national wildlife refuges, Americans will experience those feelings that God provides us, peace, solitude, comfort, safety and a sense of something greater than ourselves.

National wildlife refuges protect America’s last wild places. They are the only Federal public lands where protecting fish and wildlife habitat is the first priority.

National wildlife refuges are America’s outdoor classroom. Several million students and adults learn each year about the natural world on national wildlife refuges.

National wildlife refuges are the cornerstone of many local economies. Many refuges are tourist destinations, and that means dollars spent in surrounding communities. It is estimated that visitors to refuges spend over \$400 million annually in local economies.

National wildlife refuges help maintain our heritage by providing places for present and future generations to hunt, fish and connect with the outdoors.

America’s commitment to the National Wildlife Refuge System makes it the world’s leader in wildlife conservation. Next year’s Centennial of the National Wildlife Refuge System will celebrate America’s tradition of wildlife conservation.

As the author of this bill before us, I am pleased that the House is now poised to establish a new concession policy for our National Wildlife Refuge System. It was during one of our family visits to Sanibel Island to the Ding Darling National Wildlife Refuge that I first learned and discovered that the facilities and equipment used by concessionaires were generally not in as good a condition as they should be, and in some cases in dire shape. Refuge manager Lou Hinds spent many hours with me there and since explaining in detail the problems that we have been facing in our national wildlife refuges.

Under current law, the Fish and Wildlife Service is prohibited from using funds paid by a concessionaire to maintain or repair refuge structures.

Furthermore, with a maintenance backlog of over \$630 million, property used for a concession operation will never become a priority.

During committee consideration, we learned there are about 20 wildlife refuges that offer various concession services to the visiting public. These services range from canoe rentals, bookstores, nature guides and ferries to remote refuge areas. In almost every case concessionaires are using property owned by the Fish and Wildlife Service that is in poor condition.

In addition, refuge managers have signed a number of creative legal arrangements with concessionaires. These have included contracts, special use permits, leases and cooperative agreements. In some cases, these agreements stipulate the obligations of each party, but regrettably these details are lacking in a majority of those arrangements. This means that decisions can be arbitrary by the refuge manager at times or, in fact, concessionaires could damage essential habitat.

This legislation will solve those problems by establishing for the first time a workable, consistent and defensible refuge concession policy. Under H.R. 1370, the Fish and Wildlife Service will be allowed to credit a concessionaire for any fees they pay in the future. This money will be retained at the local refuge and it can be used to build, maintain and repair structural problems, to restore habitat and to protect refuge resources. The Service will determine if a certain repair is necessary, and they will obtain estimates for any proposed work.

In addition, the bill requires the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service to establish a standardized concession contract within 18 months of the enactment of this bill. This contract will be used by all new and existing concessionaires in the future.

This provision provides consistency throughout the refuge system, stipulates that contracts are issued under a competitive bidding process and clarifies the financial obligations that an entrepreneur must agree to before undertaking a concession.

Finally, the bill requires an annual report on the number of refuge units with concessions, a description of services offered, an accounting of fees paid by the concessionaires and a summary of all improvements made in both visitor services and structures within the refuge system. This is similar to the concessions policy Congress developed and passed and is now law regarding our National Park System. It is way past time that we do the same for our Fish and Wildlife System.

I believe this legislation will encourage improvements within our refuge system. It will foster the growth of additional concession services, and it will enhance the public's ability to appreciate the natural wonders of our National Wildlife Refuge System.

I want to thank all of my colleagues, especially the subcommittee chairman,

the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), for their hard work on this important legislation, and I urge an aye vote on H.R. 1370.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill that is before the House today is considerably different than the legislation introduced last year. It reflects the hard work of my colleague the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the careful consideration of the Committee on Resources, and as presently amended, H.R. 1370 has the potential to enhance the visiting public's experience at our national wildlife refuges. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The National Wildlife Refuge System is presently saddled with a significant \$1.3 billion operations and maintenance budget backlog. Concessionaires which operate in the refuges and offer a wide variety of services, such as we have heard, are uniquely affected by this backlog.

Presently, most concessionaires pay annual franchise fees to the National Wildlife Refuge Fund. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which runs the refuge system and owns the land and facilities, is responsible for maintaining all facilities. However, the Service gives low priority to concessionaire facilities when faced with other competing budget demands within the system. This inferior status leaves concessionaire facilities lacking and discourages concessionaires from using the refuges and providing services to visitors.

This legislation would allow the concessionaires to make necessary maintenance repairs or visitor facility improvements in lieu of cash payments for concession fees and would address simultaneously the budget backlog and improve the quality of visitor facilities.

The scope of this new permissive authority has been limited to maintenance backlog projects and other types of small scale improvement projects that increase the visitor's experience. Also, repairs or improvements would be required to be made at the refuge or refuge complex where the concession operates. I note that this legislation would not authorize the construction of any new facilities.

H.R. 1370 has been further amended to address the presently haphazard administrative process by which the Service permits concessionaires to operate within the refuge system. This legislation would require the Service to develop a new standardized concession contract for all national wildlife refuge concession activities. All concession operations would be required to be enrolled under these new contracts within 3 years.

The Service also will be required to award all contracts through competitive bidding, although the bill would exempt small scale retail operations run by nonprofit volunteer organizations, and to ensure accountability the Service will be required to forward to Congress an annual oversight report on all concession contract activities.

Perhaps most important, the bill has been amended to specify that all title interests to property and facilities and any interest in repairs or improvements made by concessionaires will remain with the Federal Government. Furthermore, H.R. 1370 states explicitly that concessionaires do not acquire any compensable interest in the property and facilities they operate or in any repair or improvement they might make.

In closing, H.R. 1370 will provide additional financial flexibility to address the chronic maintenance backlog hindering visitor services at numerous refuges. This legislation will bring much needed coherence to the administration of concession contracts, enhance the public's enjoyment and appreciation of our National Wildlife Refuge System and prevent the future establishment of concession activities that are incompatible with the refuge system's wildlife first mission.

I want to once again commend our colleague the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) on this legislation. I urge Members to support it and to improve our national wildlife refuges.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1370, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to establish requirements for the award of concessions in the National Wildlife Refuge System, to provide for maintenance and repair of properties located in the System by concessionaires authorized to use such properties, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NUTRIA ERADICATION AND MARSHLAND RESTORATION ACT

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4044) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the State of Maryland for implementation of a program to eradicate nutria and restore marshland damaged by nutria, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4044

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Wetlands and tidal marshes of the Chesapeake Bay and in Louisiana provide significant cultural, economic, and ecological benefits to the Nation.

(2) The South American nutria (*Myocastor coypus*) is directly contributing to substantial marsh loss in Maryland and Louisiana on Federal, State, and private land.

(3) Traditional harvest methods to control or eradicate nutria have failed in Maryland and have had limited success in the eradication of nutria in Louisiana. Consequently, marsh loss is accelerating.

(4) The nutria eradication and control pilot program authorized by Public Law 105-322 is to develop new and effective methods for eradication of nutria.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to the State of Maryland and the State of Louisiana for a program to implement measures to eradicate or control nutria and restore marshland damaged by nutria.

SEC. 2. NUTRIA ERADICATION PROGRAM.

(a) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Interior (in this section referred to as the “Secretary”), subject to the availability of appropriations, may provide financial assistance to the State of Maryland and the State of Louisiana for a program to implement measures to eradicate or control nutria and restore marshland damaged by nutria.

(b) GOALS.—The goals of the program shall be to—

(1) eradicate nutria in Maryland;

(2) eradicate or control nutria in Louisiana and other States; and

(3) restore marshland damaged by nutria.

(c) ACTIVITIES.—In the State of Maryland, the Secretary shall require that the program consist of management, research, and public education activities carried out in accordance with the document published by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entitled “Eradication Strategies for Nutria in the Chesapeake and Delaware Bay Watersheds”, dated March 2002.

(d) COST SHARING.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the costs of the program may not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of the program.

(2) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The non-Federal share of the costs of the program may be provided in the form of in-kind contributions of materials or services.

(e) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 5 percent of financial assistance provided by the Secretary under this section may be used for administrative expenses.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For financial assistance under this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$4,000,000 for the State of Maryland program and \$2,000,000 for the State of Louisiana program for each of fiscal years 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007.

SEC. 3. REPORT.

No later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the National Invasive Species Council shall—

(1) give consideration to the 2002 report for the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries titled “Nutria in Louisiana”, and the 2002 document entitled “Eradication Strategies for Nutria in the Chesapeake and Delaware Bay Watersheds”; and

(2) develop, in cooperation with the State of Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries and the State of Maryland Department of Natural Resources, a long-term nutria control or eradication program, as appropriate, with the objective to significantly reduce and restore the damage nutria cause to coastal wetlands in the States of Louisiana and Maryland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans chairman, has been working on this issue for many years. In fact, in 1998 Congress enacted a law he sponsored that created the Maryland Nutria Control Pilot Project, and let me briefly, for those who are not aware, as I was not, this is a nutria. It is basically a South American, somewhat of an overgrown rat, smaller sized groundhog, but it is a nonnative species that is destroying the environment in certain areas of our country.

Since that time, Federal, State and local partners have worked together to develop an effective strategy on how to address the tremendous amount of environmental destruction that is being caused by an increasing population of a semi-aquatic, non-native rodent known as nutria. This partnership has conducted various studies on the rate of wetland destruction, the reproductive capacity of nutria and alternatives to control or eradicate this species from the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge, the Fishing Bay Wildlife Management Area and Tudor Farms.

The results of the environmental impact studies were shocking. Nutria have no natural predators in Maryland and they have already consumed nearly half of the wetland marshlands at the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge. The remaining acreage is in serious peril. Unless nutria are stopped, they will continue to destroy wetlands at Blackwater, the other eight wildlife refuges on the Delmarva Peninsula and marshlands throughout the Atlantic Coast. One of the problems we have often in the Fish and Wildlife Service is when the action of humans alter the environment, such as bringing in non-native species, we often have to intervene to bring back the national environment which would be destroyed.

H.R. 4044 will authorize Public Law 105-322, and it will implement the next step in the process, which is the eradication of nutria and the restoration of wetlands which are vital to the survival of millions of migratory waterfowl, bald and golden eagles and the neotropical songbirds. In their testimony, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service stated that: “The Service recog-

nizes the need to continue cooperative efforts to eradicate nutria in the Chesapeake Bay region and will continue its commitment as a key Federal member of the nutria eradication partnership.”

At the full committee markup of this legislation, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) successfully offered an amendment to expand the scope of this measure to address nutria in the State of Louisiana. According to the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, these pesky rodents have damaged or destroyed over 100,000 acres of wetlands in their State. Despite extensive efforts and the consumption of thousands of nutria by American alligators, Louisiana’s attempt to control their growing nutria population have proven ineffective.

Under the terms of the modified bill, the Secretary of the Interior will undertake steps to control or eradicate nutria in the two States and together with the National Invasive Species Council develop a long-term nutria control and eradication program.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4044 is a carefully crafted bill that will help to solve a serious problem facing Maryland’s Eastern Shore and Louisiana’s marshlands.

□ 1430

Furthermore, it will serve as a model for other States that may face the prospect of having to fight against an invading population of nutria. I urge an “aye” vote on H.R. 4044.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4044, legislation that would authorize financial assistance to the States of Maryland and Louisiana to support efforts to eradicate nutria and restore marshland ecosystems.

There is little doubt that nutria, a large member of the rodent family introduced from South America into the United States in the 1930s, has significantly ruined or destroyed coastal wetland habitats in both Maryland and Louisiana.

The range of distribution of this invasive species continues to expand ominously as it searches out new marsh habitat for forage, shelter, and breeding. The need for direct action to address this environmental threat is real and compelling.

H.R. 4044 builds upon the measured success of a pilot program authorized in 1998 which helped develop new methods and strategies for the eradication of nutria and the Chesapeake and Delaware Bay watersheds.

It is hoped that the management, research, and public outreach activities authorized in this bill will enable wildlife biologists in both Maryland and

Louisiana to finally get a handle on controlling the widespread environmental damage caused by this noxious aquatic pest.

I urge Members also to support this important invasive-species legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4044, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

“A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the State of Maryland and the State of Louisiana for implementation of a program to eradicate or control nutria and restore marshland damaged by nutria, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WACO MAMMOTH SITE AREA INTERIOR STUDY ACT

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1925) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Waco Mammoth Site Area in Waco, Texas, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1925

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STUDY AND REPORT REGARDING WACO MAMMOTH SITE AREA.

(a) *STUDY.*—The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the State of Texas, the city of Waco, and other appropriate organizations, shall carry out a special resource study regarding the national significance, suitability, and feasibility of designating the Waco Mammoth Site Area located in the city of Waco, Texas, as a unit of the National Park System.

(b) *STUDY PROCESS AND COMPLETION.*—Section 8(c) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–5(c)) shall apply to the conduct and completion of the study required by this section.

(c) *SUBMISSION OF STUDY RESULTS.*—Not later than 3 years after funds are first made available for this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report describing the results of the study.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1925, introduced by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), would direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Waco Mammoth Site Area in Waco, Texas, as a unit of the National Park System.

Located near the confluence of the Brazos and Bosque Rivers, the Mammoth Site has become internationally known, as it contains the remains of the largest known herd of Colombian mammoths, warm weather cousins to the woolly mammoth, dying from the same event. To date, 22 mammoths have been found at the site that date back 28,000 years.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is supported by the majority and minority of the committee. In addition, the bill is supported by the administration, with the ongoing caveat that the maintenance backlog be addressed first.

I would like to add my personal congratulations and interest in this. When I was student body president at Indiana Purdue, Fort Wayne, through the geology club they promoted the nickname “The Mastedons.” It was my honor to drive through, over the objection of many, mastedons as the school name, which has stood for over 30 years. They are kind of big cousins to the mammoths.

So I am glad to see we are working to preserve this site so that we can have this for future generations to understand better the natural processes that occurred in this country and the creatures that were here before us. So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1925, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1925, introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), directs the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Waco Mammoth Site in Waco, Texas, as a unit of the National Park System.

The Waco Mammoth Site is believed to contain the remains of the largest concentration of mammoths killed during a single event. The site is located close to the confluence of the Brazos and Bosque Rivers near the city of Waco, Texas. The discovery of these mammoth remains has received international attention and Baylor University in the City of Waco have been working to protect the site.

In hearings before the Committee on Resources, we received testimony on the unique paleontological resources found on this site. The study called for by H.R. 1925 will examine what role, if any, that the National Park Service can play in the protection and interpretation of these unique resources.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS). I support the bill, as

amended, and look forward to its passage by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) for yielding me this time and for her courtesy and leadership on this legislation. I also want to commend and thank my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), for his courtesies, his comments, as well as his leadership and long understanding of the importance of these types of historic sites in our country as a way to educate future generations of young people in America about our history.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1925 is called the Waco Mammoth Site Study Bill; and as mentioned, it authorizes the study by the National Park Service to consider including the Waco Mammoth Site as a unit in the National Park System. Since there are numerous different designations in the National Park System, one of the goals of this study would be to determine the best fit for this historic site.

Mr. Speaker, as we have also heard, the Waco Mammoth Site is the largest concentration in the world of prehistoric mammoths dying from the same event. That is what makes this particular site unique and so historically significant. It is located within the city limits of Waco, Texas, my hometown, which also happens to be a suburb of the community of Crawford, Texas, a well-known central Texas community today. It is located at the confluence of the Brazos and Bosque Rivers.

The site was first discovered in 1978; and since 1984, Calvin Smith, director of the Strecker Museum at Baylor University, has been leading the effort to discovering the bones of now, I think there are even up to 24 mammoths so far. We would not be here today had it not been for the vision and dedication of Calvin Smith, and I want to thank him for his role in this legislation.

What makes this site unique, as I mentioned, is the fact that so many, in fact this could be twice the size of any previous mammoth deaths at any one site for any one given cause. What I find absolutely fascinating about it is that in the mud, again considering this was 28,000 years ago, we now have the remains of a 55-year-old bull and a 45-year-old female mammoth as they tried to lift their young calves above the flood that consumed them all. It is my understanding that this is the first known recording in history of parental instincts being shown in a prehistoric setting such as this.

This discovery has received worldwide attention. Experts such as Dr. Gary Haynes at the University of Nevada at Reno have said this site is a valuable and unique treasure that should not be lost. Dr. Haynes states the mammoth site, and I quote, “is a

part of America's rich heritage from the far past, when a much more diverse animal community populated the continent."

This site can be valued as a learning tool for school children across Texas and our country, as well as a site for study by professionals. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to approve this bill, thus bringing an invaluable archeological find one step closer to being part, as I hope, and as it should, a unit of the National Park System.

I thank all of my colleagues for their courtesy, again, their leadership; and finally, Mr. Speaker, if I could just say that nothing ever happens positive in this country or in this Congress without a real team effort, and there were a lot of folks back home as well as here in Washington that worked on this. I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman of the Committee on Resources, for his support; the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member, for his support; the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH); the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY); the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN); and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER). Again, we would not be here today without their leadership.

And back home, those who first had this vision and have worked to protect this site for years without Federal help so far, the city of Waco, its leadership, represented by Mayor Linda Etheridge and the Waco City Council and staff; people such as Margaret Mills; my friend Sam Jack McGlassen, now deceased, who originally donated this property to the city of Waco, Baylor University, for its important role in this effort; and people such as Allen Samuels and Mr. and Mrs. Buddy Bostick and so many others, who care about preserving our important history for future generations.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, the House to vote in support of H.R. 1925.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to conclude by saying that we are looking forward to seeing the continuing development and study by the National Park Service. Our National Park Service is not just great wild places; it is also important cultural and archeological finds, such as Dinosaur National Park, such as Mesa Verde, and other types of archeological finds.

This also proves that Texas not only has the biggest cattle, they at one time had the big mammoths. Even before there were people, they had huge mammoth ranches, apparently.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1925, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on the three bills just considered, H.R. 1370, H.R. 1925, and H.R. 4044.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REGIONAL PLANT GENOME AND GENE EXPRESSION RESEARCH ACT

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2051) to provide for the establishment of regional plant genome and gene expression research and development centers, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2051

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term "Director" means the Director of the National Science Foundation;

(2) the term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001); and

(3) the term "nonprofit organization" means a nonprofit research institute or a nonprofit association with experience and capability in plant biotechnology research as determined by the Director.

SEC. 2. MATCHING FUNDS.

The Director may establish matching fund requirements for grantees to receive grants under this Act.

SEC. 3. PLANT GENOME AND GENE EXPRESSION RESEARCH CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall award grants to consortia of institutions of higher education or nonprofit organizations (or both) to establish regional plant genome and gene expression research centers. Grants shall be awarded under this section on a merit-reviewed, competitive basis. When making awards, the Director shall, to the extent practicable, ensure that the program created by this section examines as many different agricultural environments as possible.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the centers established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be to conduct research in plant genomics and plant gene expression. A center's activities may include—

(1) basic plant genomics research and genomics applications, including those related to cultivation of crops in extreme environments and to cultivation of crops with reduced reliance on fertilizer;

(2) basic research that will contribute to the development or use of innovative plant-derived products;

(3) basic research on alternative uses for plants and plant materials, including the use

of plants as renewable feedstock for alternative energy production and nonpetroleum-based industrial chemicals and precursors; and

(4) basic research and dissemination of information on the ecological and other consequences of genetically engineered plants.

SEC. 4. PARTNERSHIPS FOR PLANT BIOTECHNOLOGY IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Director shall award grants to institutions of higher education, nonprofit organizations, or consortia of such entities to establish research partnerships for supporting the development of plant biotechnology targeted to the needs of the developing world. The Director, by means of outreach, shall encourage inclusion of Historically Black Colleges or Universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, or tribal colleges or universities in consortia that enter into such partnerships.

(2) In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an institution of higher education or eligible nonprofit organization (or consortium thereof) shall enter into a partnership with one or more research institutions in one or more developing nations and may also include for-profit companies involved in plant biotechnology.

(3) Grants under this section shall be awarded on a merit-reviewed competitive basis.

(b) PURPOSE.—Grants awarded under this section shall be used for support of research in plant biotechnology targeted to the needs of the developing world. Such activities may include—

(1) basic genomic research on crops grown in the developing world;

(2) basic research in plant biotechnology that will advance and expedite the development of improved cultivars, including those that are pest-resistant, produce increased yield, reduce the need for fertilizers, or increase tolerance to stress;

(3) basic research that could lead to the development of technologies to produce pharmaceutical compounds such as vaccines and medications in plants that can be grown in the developing world; and

(4) research on the impact of plant biotechnology on the social, political, economic, and environmental conditions in countries in the developing world.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation \$9,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$13,500,000 for fiscal year 2003, and \$13,500,000 for fiscal year 2004 to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) will each control 20 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, does the gentlewoman from Texas claim time in opposition?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Texas oppose the motion?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Ohio oppose the motion?

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed, and I seek to claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) controls the time as a true opponent of the motion.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill now under consideration, H.R. 2051.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) control 10 minutes of the time in favor of the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This legislation deals with a couple areas of research that the National Science Foundation is now involved in, and I would suggest that not only for the sake of this country but for the sake of the developing world that we move ahead with the kind of research in genetic modification that has the potential of not only reducing the price for farmers but that can help people. It will help people by giving a little additional priority to making sure that the products that are developed have that goal.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Science Subcommittee on Research, we held a number of hearings on plant genomics, and what I learned led me to issue a report on "Plant Genomic Research to Improve Agriculture, Human Health and the Environment."

This legislation builds on the NSF's success in funding merit-based competitive research by establishing two genomic initiatives at NSF: First, the plant genome plant gene expression research centers; and, two, the suggestion and legislation by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the partnerships for plant biotechnology in the developing world. The bill authorizes \$9 million for fiscal year 2002, and \$13.5 million for fiscal years 2003 and 2004 to carry out these activities.

What are we going to do with our new technology to make sure that we help people in this country and the rest of the world? And that is what these bills are all about, to make sure we move in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2051, the Regional Plant Genome and Gene Research Expression Act. H.R. 2051 has been a collaborative effort between me and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH). I also thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member, for their leadership in bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor.

This legislation was developed last fall because I believe we are only just beginning to unlock the potential of agricultural biotechnology. We have witnessed some of the benefits genetically improved crops have brought to American farmers, and it is time that farmers around the world are also able to enjoy the benefits of agricultural biotechnology.

H.R. 2051 establishes a competitive, merit-reviewed grant program under the National Science Foundation to award grants to eligible entities to conduct basic research on crops that can be grown in the developing world. The research supported by these grants will help scientists discover innovative solutions to some of the developing world's most intractable problems, such as hunger, malnutrition, and disease.

Last September, the House Subcommittee on Research held a hearing on the two bills that became H.R. 2051 as considered here today. The witnesses testified on the importance of Federal funding for basic research on developing world crops and indicated that this legislation fills an important funding gap in our current research environment. The witnesses also were enthusiastic about the partnership aspect of this legislation because collaborative research projects between the U.S. and developing world scientists will help develop the scientific capacity of developing nations as well as expand partnership opportunities for U.S. scientists.

The potential of basic research on developing world crops is enormous, and scientists have already produced some encouraging results. Many of us are familiar with a newly developed strain of golden rice that was developed by plant scientists to have increased Vitamin A and iron content. Golden rice was developed because Vitamin A deficiency causes more than 1 million childhood deaths each year and is the single most prevalent cause of blindness among children in developing countries. Golden rice is only the beginning of the potential benefits of biotechnology for the developing world. Biotechnology can help develop crop varieties that are resistant to insects, viruses, that can be grown in drought-stricken lands with only minimal amounts of water, that have improved nutritional content, and that vaccinate against life-threatening illnesses.

Dr. Norman Borlaug, a distinguished professor at Texas A&M University, fa-

ther of the Green Revolution, and recipient of the 1970 Nobel Peace Prize, stated in yesterday's Wall Street Journal that "Africa desperately needs the simple, effective, high-yield farming systems that have made the First World's food supply safe and secure." The technology developed through agricultural biotechnology and encapsulated in a seed is such a system. Biotechnology will not solve all of the developing world's problems, but it does have an important role to play in increasing food security and food self-sufficiency in the developing world.

Improving agriculture in the developing world often ranks low on the list of our Nation's priorities. Yet I can think of few things that are more important to our Nation's security and future prosperity than fostering stable, productive economies throughout the world. Such global stability will not take place as long as hunger, malnutrition, and disease ravage the majority of the world's population. Fortunately, we are at a time and a place where we can take positive steps to improve the lives of people around the world, and I believe H.R. 2051 makes a small, but important, contribution to this struggle.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) for working with me in a collaborative, bipartisan effort on this bill. I urge Members to vote in favor of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I call the House's attention to a document from the Southern African Seed-Initiative which states in part with regard to the restoration of sustainable agriculture in the future, "We are appealing to the regional international community and to organization in disaster relief and development assistance to take precautions: 1, to prevent the importation of inappropriate seeds to the southern Africa region which can undermine agrobiodiversity and thus food security for years; and 2, to support efforts to reconstitute locally adapted planning material and quality seed material/varieties, like indigenous landraces or farmers' varieties appropriate to the various ecosystems" this sheet goes on to claim: "Food aid, combined with the importation of often poorly adapted seed varieties, can lower yields and keep them low for years."

This information from the Seed Initiative from Southern Africa is very instructive, and reflects most seriously on the matter at hand because the truth of the matter is that all of us in this House who are very concerned about reducing hunger in the world must be careful not to create a circumstance that in our desire to use technologies that seemingly could reduce hunger, that we inadvertently use technologies which are poorly adapted to seed varieties that can end up actually increasing hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 2051, the Regional Plant Genome and Gene Expression Research Act. The bill before us is well-intentioned, but I believe it is based on an erroneous assumption. The legislation assumes that unproven technologies will solve the very serious international problem of world hunger. Technologies like genetically engineered food may have a limited role, but economics and the politics of repressive political regimes remain the significant barrier to a consistent food supply in developing nations.

The development of expensive genetically engineered foods may only exacerbate the situation. There are better alternatives. Agroecological interventions have had significantly more success in helping developing nations feed themselves with higher yields and improved environmental practices, all within reasonable costs for developing countries.

These alternatives do not further enrich the consolidated agricultural industry, but they can provide the poorest of citizens of a nation the opportunity to survive on their own means. Next week I am introducing the Real Solutions to World Hunger Act of 2002, which promotes this type of research that can quickly and effectively save millions of lives. The legislation before us today promotes a technology which is incompatible with the problem.

The cause of world hunger has more to do with inadequate food distribution than food production. The world today produces more food per inhabitant than ever before. Enough food is available now to provide 4.3 pounds for every person each day. That information from Food First/Institute for Food and Development Policy.

The poor nutrition of millions is not due to a shortage in food, but rather to problems of distribution. Why was Ethiopia exporting food during its famine in the 1980s? In an economy that is becoming increasingly market driven, food is sold to the highest bidder. But at a more fundamental level, appalling land distribution policies favoring large landowners leave land idle preventing people from growing their own food. The landless poor are at the mercy of the cash economy to buy food.

This legislation follows the biotechnology industry strategy by employing bait and switch. Almost all genetic alterations are done to make food production and processing easier and more profitable for the manufacturers. A minuscule amount of research is aimed at improved nutrition, although biotechnology companies heavily advertise this tiny amount of research. In general, their crops are being engineered to increase corporate profitability, not to alleviate world hunger.

During the 5-year period 1996 to 2000, herbicide tolerance accounted for 74 percent of genetically engineered plants. Insect resistance for North American insects, not insects in developing countries, accounted for 19 per-

cent of genetically engineered plants, and stacked genes for herbicide tolerance and insect resistance accounted for 7 percent, this according to the International Service for the Acquisition of Agribiotech Applications.

When added up, that leaves no commercialized crops that provide any benefits for the poor and developing nations. I quote from a statement made to the United Nations by delegates from 24 African states in 1998: "We object strongly that the image of the poor and hungry from our countries is being used by giant, multinational corporations to push a technology that is neither safe, environmentally friendly, nor economically beneficial to us. We do not believe that such companies or gene technologies will help our farmers to produce the food that is needed in the 21st century. On the contrary, we think that it will destroy the diversity, the local knowledge, and the sustainable agricultural systems that our farmers have developed for millennia; and it will thus undermine our capacity to feed ourselves."

□ 1500

So here again, the best intentions seemingly to help address and eradicate hunger in developing nations can in fact end up creating conditions that promote more hunger. So if African nations, according to their representatives, do not want it, then who does besides the biotechnology public relations consultants?

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I agree with much of what the gentleman from Ohio says, because that is part of our concern in this bill. What it calls for is more research. More research is going to include not only what it can do for people but also to increase the safety of any resulting product.

The gentleman mentioned that a lot of the private research so far in this area has been to simply increase profits. That is the kind of private research in genomics that have been directed at plant products that can be sold because they increase yield or they reduce the cost for the farmer. If we are going to have the kind of research that helps people, there is no doubt that Federal funding for genomic research is important, that research in areas possibly has no profit potential but that can help alleviate poverty, that can protect the environment, that can improve human health, and that can reduce our overdependence on petroleum products.

Reducing our dependency on petroleum energy is one of the areas that I have been concerned about. We have the potential to enhance the nitrogen-fixing capability of agricultural plants. Right now nitrogen fertilizer uses up approximately 6 percent of the natural gas in this country. If we can enhance the legumes the nodules that

are now in the clovers, in the soybeans, in the alfalfas, to fix that nitrogen in the soil much more effectively and efficiently and we have that potential, then we are going to reduce our dependence on energy.

Let me say that the Wall Street Journal yesterday ran an editorial by Norman Borlaug, best known as the Father of the Green Revolution. His work in developing higher yielding varieties of rice and wheat is credited with saving perhaps 1 billion people in China and India from starvation in the 1970s. Borlaug is now devoted to bringing about similar advancements in Africa where starvation remains all too common. What is his solution? His solution is to develop high yield varieties of traditional African crops such as cowpeas, cassava and how can we get there in part through biotechnology which has already shown promise for producing plants that are more tolerant to drought or can grow in soils that are too base or too acid or too salty that they cannot grow those crops now.

I would hope the gentleman would consider supporting this bill to give us the kind of research to not only ensure the safety that some are concerned about, that he is concerned about and that I am concerned about and that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is concerned about, but to develop the kind of products that can help people, not simply reduce the price to farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his comments and would like to respond. I believe he misunderstands this bill. The thrust of this bill is one of basic research at universities. The bill seeks to address the deficiency in basic genomic research on crops that can be grown in the developing world.

More importantly, the bill seeks to create strong partnerships with developing world institutions from the very beginning. In order to be eligible for funds under section 4 of this bill, research institutions are required to partner with their colleagues in developing countries. This partnership will not only help strengthen the scientific capacity of developing countries but will ensure that the basic research that is performed focuses on what developing countries perceive their own needs to be. Additionally, the bill allows for research on the impact of plant biotechnology on the social, political and environmental conditions in countries in the developing world. This provision will allow researchers to investigate many of the claims that my colleague from Ohio raises.

This bill does not force farmers in developing countries to adopt fancy technologies. It does not force the importation of genetically altered foods outside the country. On the contrary, it seeks to encourage the adoption of the

very simple technology of a better seed that was developed in conjunction with scientists from the developing world.

All of us here recognize that world hunger is an enormously complex problem with no simple solution. This bill does not pretend to hold the answer. What this bill does is provide the means for scientists in the United States and in developing countries to work together to contribute to the much larger solution to the very serious problem of hunger, malnutrition and disease in the developing world.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan and the gentlewoman from Texas for their commitment to trying to deal with this problem of world hunger. We have differences of opinion about how we can deal with it effectively.

I would suggest that the research which is called for in part of this bill, Mr. Speaker, has already been done. As a matter of fact, in the *AgBioForum*, volume 2, number 3 and 4, summer and fall of 1999, pages 155 to 162, an article by Miguel Altieri and Peter Rosset, thoroughly researched article, I might add, that claims over 38 academic sources for their conclusions, states the following in the abstract. It says:

“Advocates of biotechnology affirm that the application of genetic engineering to develop transgenic crops will increase world agricultural productivity, enhance food security, and move agriculture away from a dependence on chemical inputs helping to reduce environmental problems. This paper challenges such assertions by first demystifying the Malthusian view that hunger is due to a gap between food production and human population growth. Second, we expose the fact that current bioengineered crops are not designed to increase yields or for poor small farmers, so that they may not benefit from them. In addition, transgenic crops pose serious environmental risks, continuously underplayed by the biotechnology industry. Finally, it is concluded that there are many other agro-ecological alternatives that can solve the agricultural problems that biotechnology aims at solving, but in a much more socially equitable manner and in a more environmentally harmonious way.”

In this article, which is entitled *Ten Reasons Why Biotechnology Will Not Ensure Food Security, Protect the Environment and Reduce Poverty in the Developing World*, Altieri and Rosset point out, number one, there is no relationship between the prevalence of hunger in a given country and its population. For every densely populated and hungry nation like Bangladesh or Haiti, there is a sparsely populated and hungry nation like Brazil and Indonesia.

The second point they make, number two, most innovations in agricultural biotechnology have been profit-driven

rather than need-driven. The real thrust of the genetic engineering industry is not to make Third World agriculture more productive, but rather to generate profits.

Number three, the integration of the seed and chemical industries appears destined to accelerate increases in per acre expenditures for seeds plus chemicals, delivering significantly lower returns to growers.

Number four, recent experimental trials have shown that genetically engineered seeds do not increase the yield of crops. A recent study by the United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service shows that in 1998 yields were not significantly different in engineered versus nonengineered crops in 12 of 18 crop/region combinations.

Number five, many scientists claim that the ingestion of genetically engineered food is harmless. Recent evidence, however, shows that there are potential risks of eating such foods as the new proteins produced in such foods could, one, act themselves as allergens or toxins; two, alter the metabolism of the food producing plant or animal, causing it to produce new allergens or toxins; or, three, reduce its nutritional quality or value.

In this article, *Ten Reasons Why Biotechnology Will Not Ensure Food Security, Protect the Environment and Reduce Poverty in the Developing World*, the authors as their sixth point indicate transgenic plants which produce their own insecticides closely follow the pesticide paradigm, which is itself rapidly failing due to pest resistance to insecticides.

Number seven, the global fight for market share is leading companies to massively deploy transgenic crops around the world, more than 30 million hectares in 1998, without proper advance testing of short- or long-term impacts on human health and ecosystems.

The next point that the authors make, number eight, there are many unanswered ecological questions regarding the impact of transgenic crops.

Number nine, as the private sector has exerted more and more dominance in advancing new biotechnologies, the public sector has had to invest a growing share of its scarce resources in enhancing biotechnological capacities in public institutions.

And, number 10, much of the needed food can be produced by small farmers located throughout the world using agro-ecological technologies. In fact, new world development approaches and low input technologies spearheaded by farmers and nongovernmental organizations around the world are already making a significant contribution to food security at the household, national and regional levels in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

So again, Mr. Speaker, there already is significant research which points out concerns that need to be regarded before such legislation is brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Ohio and the gentlewoman from Texas and I, agree on a lot of these issues. The plant genome and gene expression centers will take plant biotechnology research into the next phase, beyond simply mapping and sequencing genes and toward a better understanding of gene expression.

We have got the *Arabidopsis* plant. We have cataloged those genes. We have determined the folding of several of those genes to learn more about what particular genes do. But there is a tremendous void in the information that we need to make sure the new plants are safe.

Let us not argue against having more research. Let us not argue against maybe having government do a little bit of this research instead of leaving it to the private sector that are forced to have some kind of financial rewards for what they do. The centers are going to expand on NSF's current activities in gene research by providing central locations for multidisciplinary interactive approaches to plant biotech research. This will allow researchers to develop the kind of research to allow development of safe and beneficial plant varieties and plant-derived applications.

□ 1515

Specifically in this bill, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the centers will conduct research in plant genomics related to the development of the kind of information that can lead to new varieties of enhanced crops, including those grown in nontraditional environments and those grown with reduced reliance on chemical fertilizers. These may include research into enhancing the nitrogen-fixing ability of legumes, that I earlier mentioned. The primary input, of course, of nitrogen is natural gas, so we can make ourselves a little more energy dependent while we increase the safety of the environment.

The centers are also going to expand on current biotechnology efforts that have primarily been focused on improving the production and the cost and the quantity. And exactly like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) says, we are going to move away from that to the kind of research that is going to give us better information.

I believe we are on the threshold of a new era in food production. Biotechnology will be especially important to poor subsistence farmers across the globe who struggle against the odds to bring in a good crop each year.

To address this problem, H.R. 2051 authorizes a program creating plant biotechnology partnerships for the developing world. This program is based on H.R. 2912, introduced by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON). The plant biotechnology

partnerships will provide the fundamental research needed to build on the current plant biotechnology base to address specific agricultural problems in the developing world.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it has been stated over and over here that the interest here is in just research. However, we cannot separate the kind of research that will be done here from the logic that is driving biotechnology, because this bill states that for-profit companies can be involved in this research.

Now, I agree with my friend from Michigan that we do not want to just leave it to for-profit companies, but it is in the bill. So I would just say that if we do not want for-profit companies involved, I would certainly be willing to entertain a unanimous consent request to strike that provision from this bill.

In addition to that, the total of this bill is \$36 million.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the language in the bill was not for-profit companies, it is for nonprofit organizations to be involved, so the nonprofits that are interested in something beside profit.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, may I ask the gentleman to make sure that he and I have the same copies of these bills, because often there are reprints and newer iterations. I have here under section 4: "Partnerships for Plant Biotechnology in the Developing World," under number (2), which is line 8. I am going to read it to the gentleman: "In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an institution of higher education or eligible nonprofit organization (or consortium thereof) shall enter into a partnership with one or more developing nations and may also include for-profit companies involved in plant biotechnology."

I will ask the gentleman again, I would certainly entertain the gentleman's willingness to strike that language there so that we can certainly keep the for-profit companies out of this, because, Mr. Speaker, the for-profit companies had a \$50 million advertising campaign to try to promote biotechnology, glossing over all the concerns that scientists around the world have, and they get \$36 million out of this bill if left to the language of this bill. They could get if that much.

I would be happy to have my good friend respond.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield further, this is part of the language of the bill of the gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) originally. It does not give these companies the grant. They still go to the universities to make the decision of whether there is going to be any private involvement. That is one

thing we have lacked as we searched for money, is trying to get more money in. But certainly they should not be allowed to dictate the kind of research to be done. I certainly appreciate that.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike the language.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would announce that the proponent of the motion is the only member that the Chair would recognize to ask unanimous consent to modify the motion.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one more minute.

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my unanimous consent request was objected to, it is very clear that there are Members of this House, certainly not the gentleman from Michigan, but there are members of this House who are looking to give the biotech firms a handout under the guise of helping to feed the poor.

Most genetically engineered food products and almost all research funding for the development of genetically engineered food target developing nation agriculture and consumers. Developing countries cannot afford this technology and therefore are vastly ignored.

If the biotechnology industry believes they could help mitigate hunger concerns, domestic or foreign, then requiring biotechnology companies to make available the necessary resources for this purpose is appropriate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my late father was a plant geneticist. He spent his entire career developing cotton plants and cotton seeds that could be used as food. I wish we would have had this research enabled when he was alive so he could have participated through grants at Texas A&M or the University of Texas to forward this very worthwhile research endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I very strongly support the gentlewoman from Texas and the gentleman from Michigan in their noble endeavor.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Ohio just gave all the reasons why this bill should pass. This is a bill on research where it can establish partnerships. The grants can only go to universities and nonprofits. Profit businesses can join the partnership, the consortium, but no money flows in that direction. The paper the gentleman read prior to that last statement is 3 years old. With research, that changes.

This bill only speaks to research and who can be a part of the partnership, of the consortium. It is not public dollars flowing to profit organizations. It is what we will hear more of in the future, public-private-type partnerships.

No public dollar flows to a profit organization. The dollars go to the universities, and that is where the research takes place; and it includes persons from the developing countries to be a part of the research.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge passage of this legislation. It is good legislation intended to do a good job.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation which I will be bringing to this House hopefully sometime soon, called the Real Solutions to World Hunger Act of 2002, offers new initiatives and protections to help developing nations resolve their hunger concerns.

First, to protect developing nations, genetically engineered exports are restricted to those already approved in the U.S. and approved by the importing nation.

Second, creation of an international research fund for sustainable agricultural research.

Third, U.S. prohibition on any intervention in a developing nation's effort to mandatorily license a genetically engineered crop.

Fourth, establishing the Sustainable Agriculture Trust Fund with a small tax on a biotechnology company's profits. This trust fund will fund the activities in this bill.

To understand how this bill before us, the one we are going to be voting on today, will fail to help anyone except for the biotechnology companies, I think we should examine our own Nation, our own farming practices and our domestic hunger challenges.

The United States of America, the wealthiest Nation in the world, grows substantial amounts of genetically engineered foods. Our farmers plant approximately 100 million acres a year in genetically engineered crops. However, in this great wealthy Nation of ours, plenty of families go hungry every day. Approximately 4 million low-income children under the age of 12 experience hunger each year, and an additional 9.6 million children are at risk of hunger.

The proponents of this legislation before us believe that genetically engineered foods will solve world hunger. But I question this rationale when we have so much hunger in our own Nation. This technology has not helped a single hungry family in our Nation. These hungry families need a better economy, better paying jobs, access to child care, and a decent education to solve the economic trap that leads to hunger.

It is clear that hunger is something that we must eradicate, but promoting false solutions to provide great public relations for a troubled industry does a great disservice to those who need our help the most. We all want to help resolve the hunger crisis in other nations, but only the legislation I will introduce soon will begin to deal with the real problems of world hunger.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would announce that each Member has 1 minute remaining, with the

gentleman from Michigan having the right to close.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, one more time let me say that the gentleman from Ohio has made the case for this bill. This bill speaks to research partnerships, including developing-nation participation. There is nothing in this bill that requires any kind of deportation to these developing nations. It provides a way by which they can be part of research that will provide them foods that will probably help with immunizations, extra vitamins, but only after the research is done with the involvement of scientists from the developing countries.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the passage of the bill. I think that the opponent has misunderstood the bill.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the agriculture and biotechnology industries are driving the research; and as such, they have ignored a tremendous amount of work that has been done by independent scientists that challenges the rationale of the industry itself.

There are serious issues that need to be addressed, that relate to food security as a fundamental human right. The philosopher and human rights activist of India, Vandana Shiva, has said that globalization of agriculture is violating all components of food-related human rights. She says that everywhere across the world, less food is being produced and less diverse food is being grown and less is reaching the poor and hungry. She quotes Senator McGovern as stating: "Food security in private hands is no food security at all," because corporations are in the business of making money, not feeding people.

Vandana Shiva goes on to say, "The centralized and chemical-intensive production and distribution system, linked with the green revolution model, proved itself to be undemocratic, wasteful and non-sustainable. The imperative now is to shift to a democratic food system based on sustainable production, conservation and equitable access to resources and food security for all."

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that in this bill, which authorizes certain research, if it is in any way connected, as this bill is, with the ag-biotech industry, there is no possibility that the human rights of people around the world are in any way going to be regarded.

Please defeat the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the tremendous potential of plant genomics is limited only by the creativity of the scientists and this body and Washington allowing them to do the research. This bill will help create the next generation of

plants that will provide consumer benefits, for example, plants that can be engineered to produce compounds, such as enzymes used for food processing; food that provides vaccines and antibodies; compounds used to produce biodegradable plastics; renewable energy production.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and the ranking majority member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), for all of their support in bringing this bill to the floor; and of course, I wish to say a special thanks to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Research, for all of her input and help. I think together we have crafted a good bill that will make good programs even better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2051, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to establish regional centers for the purpose of plant genome and gene expression research and development and international research partnerships for the advancement of plant biotechnology in the developing world."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS ON ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 387) recognizing the American Society of Civil Engineers for reaching its 150th Anniversary and for the many vital contributions of civil engineers to the quality of life of our Nation's people including the research and development projects that have led to the physical infrastructure of modern America.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 387

Whereas, founded in 1852, the American Society of Civil Engineers is the Nation's oldest national engineering society;

Whereas civil engineers work to constantly improve buildings, water systems, and other civil engineering works through research, demonstration projects, and the technical codes and standards developed by the American Society of Civil Engineers;

Whereas the American Society of Civil Engineers incorporates educational, scientific, and charitable efforts to advance the science of engineering, improve engineering education, maintain the highest standards of ex-

cellence in the practice of civil engineering, and ensure the public health, safety, and welfare;

Whereas the American Society of Civil Engineers represents the profession primarily responsible for the design, construction, and maintenance of the Nation's roads, bridges, airports, railroads, public buildings, mass transit systems, resource recovery systems, water systems, waste disposal and treatment facilities, dams, ports and waterways and other public facilities that are the foundation on which the Nation's economy stands and grows; and

Whereas the Nation's civil engineers, through innovation and the highest professional standards in the practice of civil engineering, protect the public health and safety and ensure the high quality of life enjoyed by the Nation's citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) acknowledges the American Society of Civil Engineers for its 150th Anniversary;

(2) commends the many achievements of the Nation's civil engineers; and

(3) encourages the American Society of Civil Engineers to continue its tradition of excellence in service to the profession of civil engineering and to the public.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 387.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to commend our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and our distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), for their excellent work on this resolution that was reported on a bipartisan basis from the Committee on Science. I also want to thank the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), my good friend, for his excellent work and for serving as an original cosponsor with myself on this bill.

Before I get into my prepared remarks, I want to say a special "get well soon" to young Lindsay Taylor, who is 12 years old down in Round Rock, Texas. She is the President of her National Junior Honor Society. She is a budding civil engineer, although I think she wants to go to the University of Texas instead of Texas A&M, where I went to engineering school. She is home sick today and we need all of our young engineers to get

well quick, so I hope that she does so very soon.

Our first great civil engineer in this country was the man that we now know as the Father of our country, George Washington. George Washington was a surveyor who made his living in between serving as a military commander in the militia, the British forces before the Revolutionary War, surveying and doing engineering work in what is now Virginia and going west, west from Virginia.

In 1852, we founded what is now called the American Society of Civil Engineers. If we had been alive at that point in time, the first great project that civil engineers would have worked on for this Nation would have been the Transcontinental Railroad. Can we imagine, if people came to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and myself, or the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) today and said, we want you to build a transcontinental railroad, could we do it? I doubt it. But the civil engineers of that time said, not a problem, and even as the Civil War was going on, they were racing to build what we now call the Transcontinental Railroad, and they hammered in the golden spike in 1869 and bound our great Nation together.

What would we have done if around the turn of the century, President Roosevelt, not Franklin Roosevelt, but Teddy Roosevelt had come and said, I want you to build the Panama Canal to bring together for the first time the Isthmus of Panama, the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. I do not think many of us could have worked on that project either successfully, but the civil engineers of that era did that. What about during World War II, if President Franklin Roosevelt had come and said, we need to build a great port infrastructure and we need to improve our highways and we need to build great pipelines, could we have done that? I do not think many of us could, but the civil engineers of that time could. What if in the 1950s President Eisenhower had come and said, Congressman Barton, I want you to build an interstate highway system. I do not think many of us could have done that, but the civil engineers of the 1950s did that.

I could go on and on. But as we begin to move into the 21st century, there are still great civil engineering projects to be done, and luckily for us today in the United States, we have over 125,000 members of the American Society for Civil Engineers, registered, professional engineers who have made it their life's work to build a better America.

We tend to think of engineers as kind of nerdy people with pencils behind their ears and slide rules in their pockets. Nothing could be further from the truth. They are people helping people. They are building the projects that bind this great Nation together and, more and more, binding this great world together.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted, along with the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), my good friend, to sponsor this resolution honoring the 150th anniversary of the American Society for Professional Engineers, because they have truly helped to build a better America.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) for his good work on this bill. I also want to join my colleague from Texas in thanking the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member.

I am very, very pleased to be here today with the gentleman from Texas to honor 150 years of service by the American Society of Civil Engineers to their profession, our country, and the world. ASCE is the oldest of engineering societies and clearly one of the best in the whole world.

Civil engineers literally have built America. One hundred and fifty years ago, there were no skyscrapers. There were wooden bridges and no one would have dreamed of spanning the Chesapeake Bay or the San Francisco Bay. Railroads were just beginning. Roads were at most two lanes and perhaps were even built of planks. Manned flights came over 50 years later.

Now, we have an interstate highway system, an intercontinental railroad system, and a network of local and international airports that are the backbone of United States commerce. Small dams have been replaced, Mr. Speaker, with huge ones that provide large volumes of electricity. Human health has been enhanced by improved sanitation with sanitary landfills, waste water treatment facilities, and distribution systems for clean water.

How much of this would have been possible without the American Society of Civil Engineers? Well, we cannot know for sure, but they certainly deserve much of the credit. ASCE has encouraged generations of bright Americans to enter the profession. It has helped develop educational standards and continuing education opportunities for civil engineers, and it has established a series of institutes and a research foundation to advance the knowledge base of the profession.

ASCE is the largest publisher of civil engineering information in the world, much of which is at the fingertips of the ASCE membership through its website. The American Society of Civil Engineers has even gone international and has formal relationships with professional organizations of civil engineers in almost 50 countries.

The small group of engineers who banded together in 1852 would not recognize today's organization. ASCE now has around 125,000 members, over half of the civil engineers in this country, organized in sections, branches, and student chapters and clubs.

ASCE is not resting on its laurels, though. It is aggressively adding new services for its members. It has ambitious programs for working with the Congress, the government at all levels, and the public at large to place the programs and policies needed to improve our built environment. Priority areas for 2002 include clean water, infrastructure financing, math and science education, natural hazards impact reduction, and smart growth.

I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to join with me in approving House Concurrent Resolution 387 that congratulates and honors the American Society of Civil Engineers on 150 years of service. This is a spectacular beginning and I will bet we have not seen anything yet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that several years ago the American Society for Civil Engineers made me one of their engineering fellows. It is a distinguished achievement award that they really give to engineers who have made a lifetime in civil engineering and have done outstanding feats. They gave it to me primarily because I am one of the few registered professional engineers in the Congress, but it is one of the high honors that I have received as a Member of the House, and the certificate is on my wall in the entry way to my office, and I am very, very proud of that.

For that and many, many reasons I think this is a resolution that is very worthwhile passing for this body because of the fine work that civil engineers have done for the last 150 years. So I hope that when the time comes to vote, we can pass it with unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that this resolution we hope to pass by unanimous consent today and send to the other body and pass it over there so that it actually can be signed by the President and presented to the leadership of the American Society for Civil Engineers sometime this fall when the actual calendar anniversary occurs for the 150th anniversary. It is very, very worth doing, and I hope that we can do it in a very bipartisan fashion.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity to join my colleagues in commending the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) for their 150 years of service to our country. I also want to thank the Gentleman from Texas, Mr. BARTON, and the Gentleman from Kansas, Mr. MOORE, for introducing this resolution.

It is difficult to imagine an area of our lives that has not been touched by civil engineers. They ensure that when we turn on the tap, we have clean water to drink. Civil engineers designed the massive transportation systems that make it possible for us to move freely and efficiently across this vast country. Moreover, civil engineers design technologies and practices to help clean up polluted water and to ensure that our natural resources are preserved for future generations.

Americans benefit from the expertise and hard work of engineers everyday, but rarely acknowledge or recognize our debt to them. I am lucky enough, however, to have a different experience with engineers. During my time on the Science Committee and especially as Chairman, I have come to rely on ASCE as a valuable resource. I may not be making headlines here, but we in government do not know everything all the time.

After the tragedy of September 11, we immediately began to look for lessons we could learn from this horrible event. FEMA put together a team, led by ASCE, to investigate the World Trade Center collapse. The team set out to discover exactly why the building collapsed, if the buildings could have stood for longer, and if more lives could have been saved. I cannot even begin to fathom the work this team did, but in eight months they delivered an important report to Congress detailing the sequence of events that led to the buildings' collapse. This work will go a long way toward saving lives. Now, we are working closely with ASCE with legislation that will hopefully make their jobs, on further building investigations, easier.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the work that civil engineers do for our country and I am ever grateful for the service that ASCE provides to this Congress and to me personally. I congratulate ASCE on 150 years and I look forward to many more.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 387.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIGHWAY FUNDING RESTORATION ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3694) to provide for highway infrastructure investment at the guaranteed funding level contained in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3694

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Highway Funding Restoration Act".

SEC. 2. FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM OBLIGATION CEILING.

Section 1102 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (23 U.S.C. 104 note; 112 Stat. 115, 113 Stat. 1753) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(k) RESTORATION OF OBLIGATION LIMITATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2003, the obligations for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs that are subject to the obligation limitation set forth in subsection (a)(6)—

"(1) shall be not less than \$27,746,000,000; and

"(2) shall be distributed in accordance with this section."

SEC. 3. RESTORATION OF OBLIGATION CEILING.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the adjustment made pursuant to section 1102(h) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century for fiscal year 2003 shall be deemed to be zero.

SEC. 4. ADJUSTMENTS TO GUARANTEE FUNDING LEVELS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all adjustments made pursuant to section 251(b)(1)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to the highway category and to section 8103(a)(5) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century for fiscal year 2003 shall be deemed to be zero. This section shall apply immediately to all reports issued pursuant to section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal year 2003, including the discretionary sequestration preview report.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING REVENUE ALIGNED BUDGET AUTHORITY.

It is the sense of Congress that the revenue aligned budget authority provision in section 251(b)(1)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 should be amended in the future to more accurately align highway spending with highway revenues while maintaining predictability and stability in highway funding levels.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION FOR HIGHWAY PROJECTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, projects and activities designated on pages 82 through 92 of House Report 107-308 shall be eligible for fiscal year 2002 funds made available for the program for which each project or activity is so designated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act. This bipartisan bill has 316 cosponsors in the House of Representatives and the other body companion measure, S. 1917, is cosponsored by 74 Members of that body.

I want to particularly thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for his support for the restoration of highway funding. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) included in the House budget resolution a provision for the outlay of these funds. I support enforcement of the budget resolution adopted by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am working with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) to address in the future a better method of calculating the Revenue Aligned Budget Authority, which we refer to as RABA. We need to more accurately align highway spending with highway revenues, while maintaining predict-

ability and stability in highway funding levels.

There is a clear and strong consensus that H.R. 3694 is the right approach to restore proposed cuts to Federal-aid highway funding in the fiscal year 2003 budget.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3694 restores not less than \$4.4 billion to the Federal-aid highway construction programs for fiscal year 2003, and ensures that these funds will be spent according to the formula established by the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, otherwise called TEA-21.

I am pleased that the leadership of the House has agreed to this expedited process. I am confident that the Senate will also take timely action on the bill before the fiscal year 2003 appropriations cycle is well underway.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is vitally necessary for three reasons. First, State Departments of Transportation cannot absorb the proposed cut of \$8.5 billion below the level of funding received in the fiscal year of 2002, a 27 percent program reduction.

Second, transportation spending keeps people employed. More than 180,000 family-wage jobs are associated with the \$4.4 billion funding restoration in this bill.

Third, cash balances in the Highway Trust Fund, the dedicated revenue source for highway and transit construction, are sufficient to accommodate this funding restoration.

Again, I want to thank the full committee ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR); the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the subcommittee ranking member, along with the full membership of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and all of the other 242 Members of the House urging immediate passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, again, I cannot stress enough the importance of this bill. It does restore the funding level where it should be to build our highways so that we can keep the 180,000 people employed and, more than that, increase the infrastructure necessities in this country and keep them on the right track.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

(Mr. BORSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), for his hard work in this measure. I also want to commend our chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr.

YOUNG), and our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), for this excellent piece of legislation; and I rise in strong support of H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important measures this House has passed in recent times was TEA 21, and in TEA 21 we were able to increase the amount of spending for our highways by over 40 percent and for transit by over 46 percent. We did that because, A, we worked together. This is the best committee in the whole House in my view for working in a bipartisan manner for the good of this country. We did that by capturing all the gasoline taxes that were sent out by the people of this country to Washington to use for transportation for its intended purpose. We had firewalls erected to protect that spending, and we came up with the revenue aligned budget authority, better known as RABA.

This process is important to make sure and to ensure that all incoming gas tax receipts are applied to transportation infrastructure spending, a core principle that members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure strongly support. Based on RABA calculations for the fiscal year 2003, the President's fiscal year 2003 budget proposes to cut funding for the Federal aid highway program by \$8.6 billion or 27 percent. A cut of this magnitude would be absolutely devastating to State and local transportation programs.

The administration claims that TEA 21 required these cuts; and, Mr. Speaker, that simply is not true. TEA 21's guaranteed highway investment level as reflected in the President's budget is a floor, not a ceiling. The administration could have and should have requested more.

The committee bill proposes to increase fiscal year 2003 funding by at least \$4.4 billion to \$27.7 billion, the level authorized in TEA 21. This bill accomplishes the following: it protects 180,000 family wage construction jobs; promotes economic recovery through the proven infusion of funds and of proven infrastructure programs; and helps compensate for the drastic and disruptive swing in highway funding in fiscal year 2003. Moreover, the additional funds are completely paid for with funds already in the highway trust funds. The fund has an 18 to \$20 billion balance that can easily accommodate this and can only be used for highway and transit programs.

In addition, and as important to providing increased funding for fiscal year 2003, the bill provides a higher budget baseline for which to measure next year's reauthorization bill. A higher baseline will improve our ability to in-

crease highway spending in the bill reauthorizing TEA 21.

Mr. Speaker, the committee bill has strong bipartisan support in the House with 317 members co-sponsoring the introduced bill. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us, H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act. It is a bipartisan bill as we have heard, and I look forward to its passage this afternoon.

We are moving this bill today as part of an agreement with the leadership in the Committee on Appropriations to ensure proper levels of highway spending under the budget firewalls in the coming year.

The supplemental appropriations bill that will soon be considered by the House will also include language addressing the guaranteed levels of spending as agreed to by the two committees. By declaring the revenue aligned budget authority, which is in the committee known as RABA, calculation for budget year 2003 to be zero, H.R. 3694 restores not less than \$4.4 billion for the Federal aid highway program. This is consistent with funding levels that were contemplated when TEA 21 was passed back in 1998, and it ensures that the funding will be spent according to the rules set forth in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century, TEA 21.

With 317 co-sponsors in the House and 74 of the companion bill in the Senate, H.R. 3694 has strong bipartisan support. The administration's 2003 budget proposal cut funding for the highway program by 27 percent. State highway programs cannot absorb a cut of this significance, nor can the economy of our country. The potential employment loss created by a cut of this magnitude could be as high as 180,000 family-wage jobs. As the economy climbs out of this short recession, the loss of this many jobs is unacceptable. And it is important to note that the highway trust fund with a cash balance of \$20 billion can sustain this spending.

The trust fund is comprised of dedicated revenues paid by highway users that can only be used for highway and transit projects.

Finally, as part of the agreement between the two committees, we have agreed to include technical changes requested by the Committee on Appropriations regarding project funding. Certain projects from the budget year 2002 Transportation Appropriations Act

have been found by the Department of Transportation to be ineligible for funding under Federal aid highway guidelines.

As Members may know, I was one who was very concerned by the actions of the Committee on Appropriations last year and trusts that we will not see a repeat this year. But in the spirit of the agreement and securing the additional needed funds, a provision making those projects eligible is included here today.

Mr. Speaker, restoring the highway funds under the firewall is supported by our Nation's governors, our mayors, industry and labor interests alike. I join with our chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), full committee ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit committee ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), and the more than 300 co-sponsors and supporting H.R. 3694, and I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me time. I thank the gentleman and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), as well as our subcommittee chair and ranking members, for working so well and so closely together to bring this bill to the floor today.

One thing we have enough money for in this time of war-time priorities, this time of recession is to continue to build our roads and bridges. Thank goodness for the trust fund. Have trust in the trust fund. It would be absurd to let the technicality of a flawed formula keep us from doing what we always do in times of recession: we build and we make jobs.

We are told, of course, that we are coming out of a recession. Well, I want someone to tell that to the 8.6 million Americans who are jobless. I want you to look at our unemployment rates: February, 5.5 percent; March, 5.7 percent; April, 6 percent. Surely Congress can do more with rising unemployment than make it worse.

We have heard about stimulus all last year. This is the stimulus bill. That is what this bill is, and it would destimulate the economy if we were to pull it. Remember, we are not restoring what we had hoped to achieve, but only what we guaranteed to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the job loss by State if there were an \$8.6 billion cut in the Highway trust fund, Mr. Speaker.

TABLE 2.—FY 2003 FEDERAL HIGHWAY FUNDS AND EMPLOYMENT LOSS RESULTING FROM \$8.6 BILLION HIGHWAY INVESTMENT CUT¹

State	FY 2002 highway program funds ²	Est. FY 2003 program funds ²	FY 2003 highway funds lost ²	Employment loss ³
Alabama	\$561,369,840	\$421,025,208	-\$140,344,632	-5,894
Alaska	314,796,052	246,539,742	-68,256,310	-2,867

TABLE 2.—FY 2003 FEDERAL HIGHWAY FUNDS AND EMPLOYMENT LOSS RESULTING FROM \$8.6 BILLION HIGHWAY INVESTMENT CUT¹—Continued

State	FY 2002 highway program funds ²	Est. FY 2003 program funds ²	FY 2003 highway funds lost ²	Employment loss ³
Arizona	486,224,631	365,140,719	-121,083,912	-5,086
Arkansas	362,652,003	275,455,607	-87,196,396	-3,662
California	2,517,465,102	1,899,291,678	-18,173,424	-25,963
Colorado	353,164,878	265,780,999	-87,383,879	-3,670
Connecticut	408,920,297	313,495,052	-95,425,245	-4,008
Delaware	119,922,416	91,097,545	-28,824,871	-1,211
Dist. of Col.	110,273,846	81,398,200	-28,875,646	-1,213
Florida	1,289,548,451	974,165,577	-315,382,874	-13,246
Georgia	988,693,630	745,903,153	-242,790,477	-10,197
Hawaii	142,271,252	106,770,543	-35,500,709	-1,491
Idaho	211,278,292	160,135,462	-51,142,830	-2,148
Illinois	933,065,783	697,096,259	-235,969,524	-9,911
Indiana	638,900,893	486,743,971	-152,156,922	-6,391
Iowa	329,542,978	247,574,819	-81,968,159	-3,443
Kansas	324,857,477	241,313,125	-83,544,352	-3,509
Kentucky	483,920,664	362,099,979	-121,820,685	-5,116
Louisiana	433,579,090	330,471,089	-103,108,001	-4,331
Maine	147,088,238	109,890,629	-37,197,609	-1,562
Maryland	446,350,792	339,318,294	-107,032,498	-4,495
Massachusetts	514,207,475	387,835,987	-126,371,488	-5,308
Michigan	894,938,840	673,029,684	-221,909,156	-9,320
Minnesota	408,448,438	309,125,401	-99,323,037	-4,172
Mississippi	355,307,069	268,482,622	-86,824,447	-3,647
Missouri	646,930,635	488,228,184	-158,702,451	-6,666
Montana	266,187,164	204,791,716	-61,395,448	-2,579
Nebraska	216,342,091	159,818,713	-56,523,378	-2,374
Nevada	199,134,908	149,455,313	-49,679,595	-2,087
New Hampshire	140,217,067	107,247,956	-32,969,111	-1,385
New Jersey	724,639,854	541,582,536	-183,057,318	-7,688
New Mexico	268,593,028	203,825,094	-64,767,934	-2,720
New York	1,410,507,671	1,064,982,917	-345,524,754	-14,512
North Carolina	776,521,747	584,307,329	-192,214,418	-8,073
North Dakota	179,364,937	134,932,708	-44,432,229	-1,866
Ohio	959,669,321	725,512,146	-234,157,175	-9,835
Oklahoma	428,337,012	318,248,522	-110,088,490	-4,624
Oregon	337,801,111	255,489,120	-82,311,991	-3,457
Pennsylvania	1,391,790,146	1,045,698,054	-346,092,092	-14,536
Rhode Island	164,112,784	123,469,448	-40,643,336	-1,707
South Carolina	461,162,748	350,138,781	-111,023,967	-4,663
South Dakota	198,817,128	150,819,598	-47,997,530	-2,016
Tennessee	624,496,977	476,815,649	-147,681,328	-6,203
Texas	2,146,259,084	1,614,117,018	-532,143,066	-22,350
Utah	216,504,854	161,358,980	-55,145,874	-2,316
Vermont	124,155,175	94,175,207	-29,979,968	-1,259
Virginia	710,248,118	544,143,511	-166,104,607	-6,976
Washington	493,771,495	368,381,629	-125,389,866	-5,266
West Virginia	308,059,534	234,857,433	-73,202,101	-3,074
Wisconsin	545,548,760	410,919,572	-134,629,188	-5,654
Wyoming	188,997,682	143,820,077	-45,177,605	-1,897
State Total	27,904,959,458	21,056,318,555	-6,848,640,903	-287,643
Allocated programs	3,894,144,542	2,148,468,445	-1,745,676,097	-73,318
Grand Total	31,799,104,000	23,204,787,000	-8,594,317,000	-360,961

¹ Includes \$80 million reduction due to proposed transfer to Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.
² Source: FHWA 2/4/02 Comparison of Estimated FY 2003 Distribution of Obligation Limitation and . . . President's Budget.
³ Employment loss is spread of 7 years, with most loss occurring in 2003 and 2004.
 Current Balance in Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund: \$18,855,632,135.

Mr. Speaker, I indicate that we are not putting the whole thing back. It is 4.4 billion because that is all they had a right to expect. They did not have the right to expect that we would exceed it. They had a right to expect what we guaranteed them when we passed TEA 21. But if we did what the administration wanted, it would be a grand total of 360,961 jobs lost. Nobody wants to do that in this Congress.

Interrupting highway construction would have a particularly chaotic effect on States which are having to cut every other program. They now have to cannibalize some highway projects in order to finish others. It would exacerbate the budget cutting already going on in every State of the Union; and, worse, it would reduce the baseline next year when we reauthorize the surface transportation bill. In other words, we would hurt the past because we are trying to catch up. We would hurt the present and we would hurt the future.

We are getting somewhere in infrastructure. I can remember just a few years ago we were sliding back so badly that we wondered if we would ever catch up. We are catching up. This is no time to turn around and go down the road to deeper unemployment and to infrastructure damage. Thanks for

all involved to help us keep moving ahead.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address one thing that has been brought up by the previous speakers. I do believe this is, in fact, a stimulus package. It is not as large as we would like to have it. There has also been mention, though, about the President's budget cut, and I will have to say that is true; but I also say I have been under seven Presidents since I have been in this body, probably one more than my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Under our Constitution the President, regardless of what party, has the responsibility to submit a budget. And as I tell every constituent that comes into our office, that is his responsibility. But it is our responsibility as a House of the people to write the budget. We write the budget. We raise the money for it from the people, and we designate how it shall be spent. That is our role. I am extremely pleased that 317 Members of this Congress decided in this case that it was more important to, in fact, restore the guaranteed money for the construction of highways and bridges and improving our

highway system than we were to take the recommendation of another branch of this great government of ours. But I never hold it against any one of the Presidents for that responsibility of submitting the budget.

It makes us do our work a little bit more efficiently and a little bit better. As I mentioned in my opening statement, a whole lot of other people, including the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), has recognized the importance of the construction of a highway system within this great Nation of ours. We have just begun. We have rail to improve. We have, again, air to improve. We have shipping ports to improve. And the responsibility of the committee, which is totally bipartisan, the responsibility of that committee is to make sure that the people of America recognize the importance of a modern transportation system being put in place for the future. And I would just like to say this is one tiny infant step in the right direction.

We must continue that as we reauthorize TEA 21, as we go forth with new rail legislation, as we go forth with other legislation packages and that we will do.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say I concur with my distinguished chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I too rise to support H.R. 3694 and to thank the chairman and the full committee ranking member and the subcommittee chairman and ranking member for their leadership to put forward the Highway Funding Restoration Act.

I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this legislation and am proud of the bipartisan way the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has worked together to bring this bill to the floor.

This bill will restore \$373 million for highway projects in California and allow projects we desperately need to move forward, including adding carpool lanes to I-680/80, widening Highway 4, and developing the Oakland Airport interconnector.

This does not replace all the money President Bush cut from California's transportation budget, but it is a good first step. It also translates to saving more than 15,000 good-paying jobs across our State. Commuters in the Bay Area face some of the worst congestion in the country, and we are also facing a sluggish economy.

Now is not the time to be cutting Federal funding for highway projects. This bill will fund California's section of the highway account at \$2.3 billion for the next year. While this amount was authorized in TEA 21 for the next year, it is not sufficient to meet California's needs. I will continue to push for more money to be used from the trust fund which has \$18 billion in cash just sitting in it.

In addition to restoring money, this bill reasserts the integrity of the budget firewalls in TEA 21 and the realigned budget authority mechanism called RABA. These provisions will ensure that local communities can plan transportation projects knowing that the Federal Government will be a predictable partner throughout the life of a project.

Every community in America depends on transportation to keep its people and local economy moving. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and keep America's transportation improvements on track.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of yielding to the next gentleman, I will yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), but I just wanted to point out that the gentleman was the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit in the last Congress when we authorized TEA 21. I want to acknowledge the superb role the gentleman played in the crafting of

that legislation and the many hours of personal endeavor he gave to the crafting of what became known as TEA 21, and his solid grasp of the issues that we fought over in this body and in the conference.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

□ 1600

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and our ranking member on the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for yielding me the time and for his very kind words. I also join in commending the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman, for his leadership; the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), ranking member; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking subcommittee member; and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), the ranking subcommittee chairman, for their leadership, not only in bringing this legislation to the floor but for last year's invaluable leadership, the last time we did TEA-21, for their leadership in that regard as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act, does have broad bipartisan support. It will restore, as we have heard, at least \$4.4 billion to the Federal aid to highway program from the amount the administration had requested. These brutal cuts would have sucked the life out of our highway program in southern West Virginia.

Keeping our new highway construction and existing road improvements on track is our number one need at this moment. This vital work saves lives and brings new jobs, especially in the southern part of West Virginia, as we are once again experiencing the devastating effects of floods that have ravaged through our area in the last couple of weeks.

We have \$18 billion sitting in the Highway Trust Fund. If anything, we need to pour more of it into building the roads our people desperately need, not less. Today, we will set a funding level of \$21.7 billion for fiscal year 2003. This will help to ensure that each of the 50 States gets the highway funding they need so they will not have to resort to postponing or canceling highway projects.

In West Virginia, we are working on many highway projects to enable our citizens to participate in interstate commerce and to open up West Virginia to new business opportunities, including the Coalfields Expressway, the King Coal Highway and upgrading the safety of Route 10.

The West Virginia DOT cannot afford to lose Federal funds necessary to plan, build and maintain these roads. I know the DOTs in the other 49 States will say the same thing about their highway projects. That is why we have such broad support for this legislation, not only from Members of Congress, but

from State governments, highway groups and others around the country.

When we wrote TEA-21, we guaranteed a minimum level of spending in the Federal aid to highway program. H.R. 3694 will ensure that the budgetary firewalls are protected. In addition, this bill restores the obligation limits for fiscal year 2003 so Federal highway spending will not be less than \$27.7 billion.

In West Virginia, we have been working to build jobs through transportation. We also have a strong transportation research center at the Rahall Appalachian Transportation Institute at Marshall University in Huntington, West Virginia, which is one of the University Transportation Centers we established in TEA-21.

The bill we will pass today will restore \$4.4 billion to the Federal aid highway program. It will protect 180,000 family wage construction jobs. In West Virginia, we will see \$45.9 million restored and 3,074 jobs protected.

We have 317 bipartisan cosponsors of this legislation because of the tremendous leadership of Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member OBERSTAR and because each Member realizes how vital a guaranteed highway funding level is to their respective States in order to secure constituents' jobs in the highway construction industry and to promote a healthy economy.

Again, I ask for enactment of this legislation and commend the leadership on both sides of the House.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The role of a chairman, Mr. Speaker, is to lead and our chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on this legislation and on many others has led. As soon as we got word of the budget language and the prospective cut, without waiting to see the actual document, the chairman sprang into action. We joined forces, as we do on this committee and as we are known almost legendarily in the House, on a bipartisan basis, to rectify the wrong.

The chairman was quite right in pointing out that, I choose to say, with all the Presidents with whom we have served, not under. We are a coequal branch. This is not new. Cutting highway funds started with President Lyndon Johnson in 1968 on the recommendation of the same gang that did one, the then Bureau of the Budget, that said we need to cut funds in order to dampen inflation, build up a bit of a surplus to offset the burgeoning surplus at the beginning of the Vietnam War, and as the chairman observed, it is an old dictum that the President proposes but the Congress disposes.

As astute and an early observer as Edmund Burke, the noted British historian, political science writer, a century ago observed that a presidential budget in the hands of a strong Speaker is worth little more than the paper on which the words are written. Well, we intend to do what Burke observed,

to assure that those are just simply numbers on paper and that the intent of TEA-21 is carried out.

It will restore \$4.4 billion of the President's 27 percent cut in the Federal aid highway program. Important for a number of reasons, as other speakers have noted, this cut itself will, or this restoration will affect 180,000 jobs, but the original budget cut proposed would affect 360,000 jobs over the next 5 years. Worse, it will result in a budget surplus in the Highway Trust Fund of \$34 billion and extend it out over a decade. It will reach a nearly \$80 billion surplus in the Highway Trust Fund.

By way of comparison when we started with TEA-21 in January of 1998, there was a \$29 billion surplus in the Highway Trust Fund. We would be going backward. In fact, if we do not make this restoration the last year of funding for TEA-21 will be less than the first year of TEA-21. That is not the direction in which the American people want this country to move or expect this committee to move in.

We do not establish a ceiling for the highway program. The bill says highway funding should be at least \$27.7 billion. That is the minimum, and as the process goes forward, I hope we will be able to restore even more than that as we get into the final process of the budget and the supplemental appropriations bill with the other body.

The Highway Trust Fund now can support \$30 billion in outlays. By the end of this process, I hope we will have achieved an outcome that expends every last penny of that Highway Trust Fund. We did not just do this as an accident when we crafted TEA-21. That was a hard fought bill here on this floor till 2:30 in the morning on the budget process in 1997, and then all the way through the committee and into 1998, and we had an overwhelming vote, and then we went to conference and we had a 2-month conference with the United States Senate. Every piece of that legislation was fought through.

The other body did not want to have a guaranteed account. The other body did not want to have the levels of authorization that we set forth in what became TEA-21, and this committee, standing for this body, fought for the guaranteed account and for the revenue adjusted budget authority, and we got it in there. We cannot let a presidential or OMB dictum take it away from us and from the people of this country.

The extraordinary history of TEA-21 has been that in the 42 years of the interstate highway program we invested \$114 billion of Federal funds to build the 44,000-mile interstate highway system. In 4½ years of TEA-21, we invested \$114 billion. We did in 4½ years what it took 42 years of the interstate highway program, and in the process we created 1½ million new jobs, the good jobs, the jobs that buy the homes and buy the cars and buy the household appliances and put the kids

through school, jobs that have sustained the economic expansion of the last 7 years, until it hit the body with that recession that we are trying to creep out of.

The Highway Trust Fund is a dedicated account. It cannot be used for any other purpose. It can only be used for highway and transit funding. It can support more funding, and when we crafted TEA-21, we knew that the year-by-year levels that we authorized would be less than what could be spent. So we provided an additional \$15 billion of authorizations over and above the amount specified year by year.

There is enough in the Highway Trust Fund now. There is a surplus of roughly \$20 billion, and let us acknowledge that maybe 6 or \$7 billion of that is already spoken for by forward funding of the States, but there is enough in there to support the level of funding that we authorized for this coming fiscal year for TEA-21, and we ought to do it. We ought to do it because if we for no other reason, the cost of congestion, the congestion tax in just 68 major metropolitan areas of the United States is \$78 billion last year as verified by the Texas Transportation Institute in its report on congestion.

This is a bargain, \$8.6 billion restored or \$4.4 billion that we are trying to do in this bill. That is a bargain to help buy down the cost of congestion.

A key element of this bill is a sense of Congress that we will work together in a reauthorization to ensure that the revenue alignment mechanism of RABA is fine-tuned to more accurately align highway fund spending with highway revenues so as to have greater predictability and stability in highway funding.

I understand also that our chairman, gentleman from Alaska, has reached an agreement with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to attach the language of this bill to the supplemental appropriations bill instead of language that would have declared that the RABA mechanism shall have no force or effect. Now that is very serious language that would have had a very, very bad effect, and I think striking that language and supplanting our bill is a good agreement.

That agreement also has a dark side, and the dark side is that we also have to agree to authorize projects that were earmarked in the Transportation Appropriations Act this fiscal year that are ineligible for funding. I do not want to debate the merits of those particular projects, but I just want to focus on process.

This is an example of legislative process that is spinning out of control. In the last several years we have moved away from deliberative consideration of legislation, including transportation appropriations bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has expired. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for his generosity.

Two-thirds of the Members of this body did not serve in this body in prior years when there were different rules that now are routinely waived. We had transportation appropriations conference reports submitted to us at 7 a.m. on the day the bill is to be considered 2 hours later, no time for the staff of the majority or the minority to evaluate what is in those bills. Members were lucky if they saw a copy, let alone have an idea of what was in it.

Similarly, the other body no longer passes appropriation bills with numbered amendments, so that when they come over here from conference there is no opportunity to stand up and challenge a particular numbered amendment in an appropriation bill.

In 1993, Chairman Natcher of the Committee on Appropriations brought the transportation appropriation conference report with 63 amendments in disagreement. We could challenge each one of those. We no longer can do that.

□ 1615

We no longer even have the time to consider in appropriate fashion what has been sent from the other body, whether in a conference report or otherwise.

Now we ought to know before we vote what we are voting on. We should know that bills that earmark interstate highway funds for projects that are not on the interstate are pending before us; we ought to know that the bill before us commits public lands funds for projects that do not involve Federal lands; that scenic byway funds are for a project that is not on a scenic byway; that bridge replacement funds are dedicated to a project that does not replace a bridge.

We are in the position in this committee of voting without having an opportunity to know what we are voting on and, therefore, to object to what we are voting on. We need to restore the deliberative process to this body's consideration of appropriation bills.

I know that I speak for myself, I know I speak for the Members on the Democratic side, and I know that I express the frustration that the chairman and members of our committee on the majority side have as well. Let us restore a deliberative process so that we can do the public's business in a fair and effective way.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the statements of my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), are absolutely true. I am hoping we can convince the

leadership on this side of the aisle, and, of course, the leadership on that side of the aisle, that what is sent to us from the other body in the waning hours of any session has been done inappropriately and that we have to have the time to make sure we are actually following the proper procedure and that we do not rush to leave this body and leave, very frankly, some things done inappropriately, as were done last year in October, because we do have to rectify that now.

I have let it be known to Members that went back to their districts and made statements of what they had achieved, and they had not achieved that, that I understand their dilemma. So this is a one-shot deal for them, and I hope everybody watching this in their office who are on that list makes sure they understand this is the only time they are going to get a chance to get projects agreed to, as it goes through our committee, or at least in consultation with the chairman and myself, and of course the ranking member. Because that is the appropriate way to do it.

The other body, the only way we can control that body is to reject what they send to us, and that takes a great deal of courage. I am hoping we have the courage to say no, not until we take the time to do what is right legislatively, with a great deal of deliberation, and the ability to do the job that we have been elected to do. This has been going on now for about 4 or 5 years, and I think it is time the House stands up and says no, this is not going to happen, you are not going to send us a great big bill, bigger than that room itself, and not know what is in it.

My staff and myself have spent time, primarily my staff, and I will admit that, just researching what was done last year to find out what projects were put in that were not authorized and, very frankly, took monies from projects that were authorized; and we do not think that is the correct way to go.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for not only yielding me this time, but for his leadership on this issue, and I also commend the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

I just simply rise in support of this bill, H.R. 3694, because this bill, the Highway Funding Restoration Act, is going to restore no less than \$66.5 million in highway funding in my State of Maryland, and that is going to represent 2,725 jobs. So I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD an exchange of letters between the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), Chairman of the Committee on the Budget, which I referred to earlier.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 2, 2002.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on Budget, Cannon
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 2, 2002, regarding H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act and for your willingness to waive consideration of provisions in the bill that fall within your Committee's jurisdiction under House Rules.

I agree that your waiving consideration of relevant provisions of H.R. 3694 does not waive your Committee's jurisdiction over the bill. I also acknowledge your right to seek conferees on any provisions that are under your Committee's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference on H.R. 3694 or similar legislation, and will support your request for conferees on such provisions.

As you request, your letter and this response will be included in the committee report on the legislation as well the Congressional Record during consideration on the House Floor.

Thank you for your cooperation in moving this important legislation.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 2, 2002.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: On May 1, 2002 the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure ordered reported H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act. At introduction, H.R. 3694 was referred solely to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. In committee, however, an amendment was adopted that added three new sections to the bill. Section four, "Adjustments to Guarantee Funding Levels," and section five "Sense of Congress Regarding Revenue Aligned Budget Authority" are within the primary jurisdiction of the Budget committee. I want to thank you for working closely with me to ensure that those provisions were acceptable to the Budget Committee.

Because of our close working relationship on this matter and in order to expedite the consideration of H.R. 3694, I do not intend to seek a sequential referral of the bill as ordered reported. In not seeking a sequential referral of H.R. 3694, the committee does not waive its jurisdiction or its prerogatives over this legislation. The Budget Committee also reserves its authority to seek conferees on H.R. 3694 or a similar Senate bill with respect to provisions that are within the committee's jurisdiction; and, I ask your commitment to support any such request by the Budget Committee.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in your committee report and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration. Thank you for your assistance and cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to state my enthusiastic support of H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act.

First of all, I would like to salute the Chairman of the full Committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways & Transit, the

gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Petri). Just as importantly, the leadership abilities of the ranking member of the full Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the ranking member of the Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), were important components in this entire process.

I have been a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee since my first term, and things are no different now than in 1983. Smart investments in our nation's infrastructure brings about national economic benefits. It's estimated that every dollar invested in our highway system yield \$2.60 in economic benefits.

As many of my colleagues in this body may know, the Administration's FY 2003 budget request would have reduced Federal-Aid highway funding to \$23 billion down, which represents a dramatic decrease from FY 2002 funding levels.

Many of my colleagues were rightfully concerned at this funding request, and I shared those concerns. While \$23 billion may sound like a lot of money and more than sufficient, the reality is much different. The real funding needs for our infrastructure already exceeds current funding levels by billions and billions. Needless to say, the proposed decrease would have caused potential transportation funding problems in every state and in every congressional district.

For my home state of Illinois, under the proposed budget, we would have seen a decrease of \$236 million in highway funds in FY 2003, and there would have been serious ramifications across Illinois. Highway and road projects across Illinois would have been adversely impacted. Just as importantly, it could have also meant the loss of 10,000 jobs—jobs that we can ill afford to lose.

By restoring the highway funds to the levels authorized under TEA 21, Illinois would have nearly \$139 million restored, and by funding our transportation needs in a fiscally responsible fashion, we all win.

I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 3694. With nearly 320 cosponsors, it's clear to see that there is broad, bipartisan support for this bill. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this important piece of legislation.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act. This important legislation restores critical funding for the Federal-Aid Highway Program.

Upon enactment of TEA 21 in 1998, funding for the Federal-aid highway program was linked to highway user fee revenues deposited into the Highway Trust Fund. This was done partially by including a budgetary mechanism included in TEA 21 called Revenue Aligned Budget Authority (RABA), which adjusts the guaranteed amount of highway funding available to reflect the most recent estimates of Highway Trust Fund revenues.

An unexpected downturn in highway revenues caused by the RABA provision of TEA 21 resulted in a decrease of an \$8.6 billion or 27 percent cut in highway funding in the President's FY 2003 budget proposal.

H.R. 3694 restores billions of critical dollars for our state departments of transportation as they cannot be expected to absorb a cut of this magnitude in one year, especially at a time when State revenues are also declining. The 27 percent cut in highway funds proposed

in the president's Budget will decimate State transportation programs, delay efforts to decrease road congestion and deny the traveling public all of the benefits that would result from reduced congestion—shortened travel times, increased productivity and economic growth, and improved safety.

This shortfall will have a severe negative impact on New Mexico and will result in a decrease of \$69 million for the New Mexico State Highway and Transportation Department. For many in the Intermountain West, it is not unheard of for people to commute 70 miles to and from work. As a result, the transportation on our roadways is absolutely crucial. A loss of \$69 million will cause the postponement of several important highway construction projects, as well as reductions in money spent on road maintenance. In addition, it is projected that New Mexico will lose an estimated 2,700 jobs as a result of the shortfall.

I am sure many other states will face similar funding and job losses if these monies are not restored for FY 03. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3694 and avoid a devastating shortfall in state transportation budgets.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my full support to the passage of H.R. 3694, this is vital legislation, needed not just for our roads, bridges, and interchanges but also for our towns, our states, and our national economy.

There is no doubt that our economy is not expanding as it was just a couple of years ago. Unemployment is at a six year high and consumer confidence is low. There is a way, however, to provide good jobs, expand commerce, and make lasting investments in our country and that is to restore highway funding.

This year's budget has an \$8.6 billion cut to federal-aid highways. The swings in our economy have translated into a wild swing in how we administer highway funding. Just last year, the Treasury Department predicted a \$4.5 billion increase in funding levels, only to be faced with a \$4.4 billion drop. We must now carefully choose our funding priorities.

Without the restoration of this money we will only exacerbate the economic downturn. In my home state of Utah, where highway funding is at a premium, these cuts mean a \$55 million dollar shortfall in roadway funds. This means the loss of jobs and contracts-over 3,000 jobs in Utah alone and 180,000 jobs across the country.

Finally, we have already collected the taxes for the trust fund—it was paid by every person who filled a gas tank, rode a bus, or drove a car last year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a short-term fix. While the idea of Revenue Aligned Budget Authority has worked well in the past, it is clear that we need to adjust the formula to prevent future cuts from happening.

This is a uniquely bi-partisan and bi-camerae bill that will immediately help all of our constituents and ensure that we continue to make good sound investments and create good, well paying jobs.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong support of H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act.

This Member would like to begin by commending the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee,

and the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking Member of the Committee, for their hard work in bringing this bill to the Floor. With 317 cosponsors, it is clear that the vast majority of House Members recognize the importance of H.R. 3694.

Mr. Speaker, Americans who pay the gas tax at the pump expect those dollars to be used for roads and other transportation expenses, and they expect that the money will be made available promptly. Any budget decision to spend less on road construction and maintenance would be a bad fiscal decision as we attempt to move from an economic recession. It would be a serious mistake to cut infrastructure spending at this critical time.

The bill would restore a minimum of \$4.4 billion for highway programs in the budget. This would bring highway funding back to the level anticipated when the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) was enacted. For the State of Nebraska, this legislation would result in the restoration of \$32 million.

The Highway Trust Fund contains a surplus of about \$20 billion—money already paid in gas taxes. Motorists deserve to have these funds used expeditiously for transportation purposes, rather than to accumulate huge trust fund surpluses.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this bill, this Member urges his colleagues to support H.R. 3694.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act. This bill restores \$4.4 billion in transportation funding and brings us back to the TEA-21 floor of \$27.7 billion. It also ensures that this funding will be used to repair decrepit roads and bridges by placing it behind TEA-21's firewalls.

Every state in America will be affected by the \$8.8 billion reduction in highway funding proposed by President Bush. While the RABA formula was responsible for the large upswing in FY2002 and the large downturn in FY2003, we must continue to tie gas tax receipts to Trust Fund expenditures to ensure that surpluses are not kept artificially high for budgetary gimmicks.

The President and this Congress have the authority to restore this critical funding, and I am pleased that we are here today to take the first step. H.R. 3694 sets a funding floor of \$27.7 billion, a \$4.4 billion improvement over President Bush's budget proposal. However, I believe that we can and must do better.

I understand that the Senate is considering doing somewhat better and restoring \$5.7 billion. Such an increase can be sustained by the Trust Fund given the current \$20 billion surplus and projected receipts. I urge the House to work with the other body to achieve at least that amount.

The \$8.8 billion reduction contained in the President's budget request would result in a \$37 million decrease in funding for my state. H.R. 3694 restores about \$22 million leaving a \$15 million difference. Maine's transportation needs are significant, and the backlog of roads and bridges in need of repair continually grows. Harsh winter weather and extensive use by both tourists and heavy trucks take their toll on our roads.

Currently, Maine needs to repair 4,000 miles of its estimated 8,300 highway miles. In its biennial budget, only 200 of these miles can be

repaired. At this rate Maine will finish its arterial highways in 8 years, and major collectors in 34 years. That pace is obviously insufficient to maintain the safe and reliable transportation network that is crucial to my state's economic future.

Closing the remaining \$15 million deficit would allow the repair of approximately 30 additional miles. While this number may seem small, 30 miles can be critical in providing safe access to rural Maine communities.

Mr. Speaker, I also strongly support Section 6 of this bill which specifically authorizes 49 projects which encountered eligibility problems. Three of these projects are located in Maine. It is absolutely critical that this funding go forward to assist the communities of Brewer, Portland and Aroostook County.

I want to reiterate that the funding level we are setting here today is a floor, not a ceiling. I am supporting this legislation as a first step in ensuring that the infrastructure needs of our communities in Maine and throughout the country can be met. I hope that we will work to go beyond this floor and restore the remaining funding that our states need and deserve.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act, critical legislation introduced by my friend and colleague, Mr. YOUNG.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, under TEA-21, funding for the federal-aid highway program was linked to highway user fee revenues deposited into the Highway Trust Fund (HTF). This was achieved in part by a budgetary mechanism called RABA, the Revenue Aligned Budget Authority, which adjusts the guaranteed amount of highway funding available to reflect the most recent estimates of HTF revenues. Due to an unexpected downturn in highway revenues (attributable to a decline in gas, tire, and truck sales, and the overall economic recession), the President's FY 2003 budget proposed an \$8.6 billion, or 27 percent cut in highway funding. H.R. 3694 restores \$4.4 billion to the highway program (a return to TEA-21's FY 2003 levels), and preserves TEA-21 "firewalls," ensuring that the additional money will be spent on highway projects.

House passage of this legislation will send an important message that these funds will be available to states to continue work on vital transportation projects. TEA-21 was a huge win for Virginia, resulting in hundreds of millions of dollars more each year in federal aid for transportation projects. This funding meant progress in our fight against traffic congestion, enhanced highway safety, and thousands of jobs—good, family-wage jobs we can't afford to lose. Halting this progress by cutting funding 27 percent would be devastating to Virginia, to our local economies, and to the men and women whose livelihood depends on transportation-related projects.

Many projects critical to the continued improvement of Virginia's transportation infrastructure are currently in the works or being planned—while many others are being set aside due to funding shortages at the state and local levels. In my Northern Virginia congressional district, safety, quality of life and the overall economy depend largely on maintaining TEA-21 funding. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act and I want to thank Chairman

YOUNG, Ranking Member OBERSTAR and my other colleagues from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their leadership on this important bill. The President's proposed 2003 Budget cuts federal-aid highway funding in my state of Tennessee by over \$158 million. The loss of these funds will result in the layoffs of thousands of hardworking Tennesseans—approximately 6,000 lost jobs—as the state cuts back on bidding out projects at a time when we should be creating jobs, not eliminating them.

This unprecedented cut will put the brakes on highway improvement projects not just in Tennessee, but throughout the country. After September 11th, we need to ensure adequate mobility for our national defense. The cuts offered by the President won't help our mobility and, in fact, stand to increase congestion and safety hazards for the motoring public. The state aid formula in TEA-21 was meant to establish a floor, not a ceiling, and the President is giving states the minimum at a time when the economy cries out for more investment in our transportation infrastructure.

That is why we must rally to enact the Highway Funding Restoration Act and restore \$4.4 billion for our highways. Of this amount, this measure would restore \$92 million or approximately 58% of Tennessee's lost highway funds. Although I would like to see the entire funding level of \$158 million for Tennessee returned to the budget, I support this compromise to save roads and jobs in Tennessee and across the nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill before us.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Federal investment in transportation is critical to moving our nation's people, goods, and economy. Maintaining and meeting our federal commitment to transportation spending is an important first step.

I was proud to serve on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee that authored the 1998 Federal surface transportation-spending bill entitled TEA-21 (the Transportation Equity Act for the Twenty-first Century). This legislation provided record levels of guaranteed funding for highways, bridges, transit, and enhancement programs. In addition to funding, it also created a policy framework that emphasizes good planning, with a focus on public participation and environmental goals. All of these factors are critical tools to building more livable communities—where families have choices about how they travel and where they live.

I was greatly concerned when earlier this year, the Bush Administration proposed in its fiscal year 2003 Budget a significant decrease in transportation spending from what Congress approved last year. This cut of \$8.6 billion, or a 27 percent reduction in highway funding, is based on the Revenue Aligned Budget Authority (RABA) provision of TEA-21. The need for infrastructure management, improvement, and new capacity has only increased and this funding is critical to the transportation plans in many communities. In Oregon alone, the impact is a loss of almost \$51 million.

As an original co-sponsor of H.R. 3694, I was proud to join with other members of Congress in sending a strong signal that our federal commitment to transportation infrastructure must be met. This bill would increase fiscal year 2003 highway funding by at least \$4.4 billion above the level requested in the President's Budget.

Some have argued that since highway programs benefited from RABA in previous years, that they must now suffer the negative consequences, too. While this seems a logical argument, there are some important variables that come into play. Perhaps the most glaring is the impact that such a large cut would have on state transportation departments. Many state DOTs are already facing funding constraints while they are also struggling to maintain existing roads and provide solutions to reducing the growing levels of traffic congestion. Second, transportation spending keeps people employed building infrastructure critical to economic growth. Cutting highway spending by 27 percent would lead to significant job loss and threaten our economic recovery. Finally, there is already a cash balance in the Highway Trust Fund of roughly \$20 billion that could be used to help restore the \$4.4 billion proposed in this bill.

In the upcoming year Congress will begin reauthorizing TEA-21. This will be an important opportunity to re-examine federal transportation policies and funding levels, including the RABA provision. I encourage my colleagues today to pass this bill and help restore the much-needed highway funding that will help states meet their transportation needs, help keep the economy growing, and help to build more livable communities.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3694, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT ENHANCEMENTS FOR WOMEN ACT OF 2002

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4069) to amend title II of the Social Security Act provide for miscellaneous enhancements in Social Security benefits, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4069

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act of 2002".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—BENEFIT ENHANCEMENTS

- Sec. 101. Repeal of 7-year restriction on eligibility for widow's and widower's insurance benefits based on disability.
- Sec. 102. Exemption from two-year waiting period for divorced spouse's benefits upon other spouse's remarriage.
- Sec. 103. Months ending after deceased individual's death disregarded in applying early retirement rules with respect to deceased individual for purposes of limitation on widow's and widower's benefits.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986

- Sec. 201. Exclusion from gross income for interest on overpayments of income tax by individuals.
- Sec. 202. Deposits made to suspend running of interest on potential underpayments.
- Sec. 203. Partial payment of tax liability in installment agreements.

TITLE I—BENEFIT ENHANCEMENTS

SEC. 101. REPEAL OF 7-YEAR RESTRICTION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR WIDOWS AND WIDOWER'S INSURANCE BENEFITS BASED ON DISABILITY.

(a) WIDOW'S INSURANCE BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(e)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), by striking "which began before the end of the period specified in paragraph (4)";

(B) in paragraph (1)(F)(ii), by striking "(I) in the period specified in paragraph (4) and (II)";

(C) by striking paragraph (4) and by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (9) as paragraphs (4) through (8), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (4)(A)(ii) (as redesignated), by striking "whichever" and all that follows through "begins" and inserting "the first day of the seventeenth month before the month in which her application is filed".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 202(e)(1)(F)(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(e)(1)(F)(i)) is amended by striking "paragraph (5)" and inserting "paragraph (4)".

(B) Section 202(e)(1)(C)(ii)(III) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(e)(2)(C)(ii)(III)) is amended by striking "paragraph (8)" and inserting "paragraph (7)".

(C) Section 202(e)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(e)(2)(A)) is amended by striking "paragraph (7)" and inserting "paragraph (6)".

(D) Section 226(e)(1)(A)(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 426(e)(1)(A)(i)) is amended by striking "202(e)(4)".

(b) WIDOWER'S INSURANCE BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(f) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(f)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), by striking "which began before the end of the period specified in paragraph (5)";

(B) in paragraph (1)(F)(ii), by striking "(I) in the period specified in paragraph (5) and (II)";

(C) by striking paragraph (5) and by redesignating paragraphs (6) through (9) as paragraphs (5) through (8), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (5)(A)(ii) (as redesignated), by striking "whichever" and all that follows through "begins" and inserting "the first day of the seventeenth month before the month in which his application is filed".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 202(f)(1)(F)(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(f)(1)(F)(i)) is amended by striking "paragraph (6)" and inserting "paragraph (5)".

(B) Section 202(f)(1)(C)(ii)(III) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(f)(2)(C)(ii)(III)) is amended by striking “paragraph (8)” and inserting “paragraph (7)”.

(C) Section 226(e)(1)(A)(i) of such Act (as amended by subsection (a)(2)) is further amended by striking “202(f)(1)(B)(ii), and 202(f)(5)” and inserting “and 202(f)(1)(B)(ii)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to benefits for months after November 2002.

SEC. 102. EXEMPTION FROM TWO-YEAR WAITING PERIOD FOR DIVORCED SPOUSE'S BENEFITS UPON OTHER SPOUSE'S REMARRIAGE.

(a) WIFE'S INSURANCE BENEFITS.—Section 202(b)(5)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(b)(5)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The criterion for entitlement under clause (ii) shall be deemed met upon the remarriage of the insured individual to someone other than the applicant during the 2-year period referred to in such clause.”.

(b) HUSBAND'S INSURANCE BENEFITS.—Section 202(c)(5)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(c)(5)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The criterion for entitlement under clause (ii) shall be deemed met upon the remarriage of the insured individual to someone other than the applicant during the 2-year period referred to in such clause.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO EXEMPTION OF INSURED INDIVIDUAL'S DIVORCED SPOUSE FROM EARNINGS TEST AS APPLIED TO THE INSURED INDIVIDUAL.—Section 203(b)(2)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 403(b)(2)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The requirement under such clause (ii) shall be deemed met upon the remarriage of the individual referred to in paragraph (1) to someone other than the divorced spouse referred to in such clause during the 2-year period referred to in such clause.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to benefits for months after November 2002.

SEC. 103. MONTHS ENDING AFTER DECEASED INDIVIDUAL'S DEATH DISREGARDED IN APPLYING EARLY RETIREMENT RULES WITH RESPECT TO DECEASED INDIVIDUAL FOR PURPOSES OF LIMITATION ON WIDOW'S AND WIDOWER'S BENEFITS.

(a) WIDOW'S INSURANCE BENEFITS.—Section 202(e)(2)(D)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(e)(2)(D)(i)) is amended by inserting after “applicable,” the following: “except that, in applying paragraph (7) of subsection (q) for purposes of this clause, any month ending with or after the date of the death of such deceased individual shall be deemed to be excluded under such paragraph (in addition to months otherwise excluded under such paragraph).”.

(b) WIDOWER'S INSURANCE BENEFITS.—Section 202(f)(3)(D)(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(f)(3)(D)(i)) is amended by inserting after “applicable,” the following: “except that, in applying paragraph (7) of subsection (q) for purposes of this clause, any month ending with or after the date of the death of such deceased individual shall be deemed to be excluded under such paragraph (in addition to months otherwise excluded under such paragraph).”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to benefits for months after November 2002.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986

SEC. 201. EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME FOR INTEREST ON OVERPAYMENTS OF INCOME TAX BY INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to items specifically excluded

from gross income) is amended by inserting after section 139 the following new section:

“SEC. 139A. EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME FOR INTEREST ON OVERPAYMENTS OF INCOME TAX BY INDIVIDUALS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, gross income shall not include interest paid under section 6611 on any overpayment of tax imposed by this subtitle.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a failure to claim items resulting in the overpayment on the original return if the Secretary determines that the principal purpose of such failure is to take advantage of subsection (a).

“(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINING MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—For purposes of this title, interest not included in gross income under subsection (a) shall not be treated as interest which is exempt from tax for purposes of sections 32(i)(2)(B) and 6012(d) or any computation in which interest exempt from tax under this title is added to adjusted gross income.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 139 the following new item:

“Sec. 139A. Exclusion from gross income for interest on overpayments of income tax by individuals.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to interest received after December 31, 2006.

SEC. 202. DEPOSITS MADE TO SUSPEND RUNNING OF INTEREST ON POTENTIAL UNDERPAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 67 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to interest on underpayments) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 6603. DEPOSITS MADE TO SUSPEND RUNNING OF INTEREST ON POTENTIAL UNDERPAYMENTS, ETC.

“(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE DEPOSITS OTHER THAN AS PAYMENT OF TAX.—A taxpayer may make a cash deposit with the Secretary which may be used by the Secretary to pay any tax imposed under subtitle A or B or chapter 41, 42, 43, or 44 which has not been assessed at the time of the deposit. Such a deposit shall be made in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe.

“(b) NO INTEREST IMPOSED.—To the extent that such deposit is used by the Secretary to pay tax, for purposes of section 6601 (relating to interest on underpayments), the tax shall be treated as paid when the deposit is made.

“(c) RETURN OF DEPOSIT.—Except in a case where the Secretary determines that collection of tax is in jeopardy, the Secretary shall return to the taxpayer any amount of the deposit (to the extent not used for a payment of tax) which the taxpayer requests in writing.

“(d) PAYMENT OF INTEREST.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 6611 (relating to interest on overpayments), a deposit which is returned to a taxpayer shall be treated as a payment of tax for any period to the extent (and only to the extent) attributable to a disputable tax for such period. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, rules similar to the rules of section 6611(b)(2) shall apply.

“(2) DISPUTABLE TAX.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘disputable tax’ means the amount of tax specified at the time of the deposit as the taxpayer's reasonable estimate of the maximum amount of any tax attributable to disputable items.

“(B) SAFE HARBOR BASED ON 30-DAY LETTER.—In the case of a taxpayer who has been issued a 30-day letter, the maximum amount

of tax under subparagraph (A) shall not be less than the amount of the proposed deficiency specified in such letter.

“(3) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (2)—

“(A) DISPUTABLE ITEM.—The term ‘disputable item’ means any item of income, gain, loss, deduction, or credit if the taxpayer—

“(i) has a reasonable basis for its treatment of such item, and

“(ii) reasonably believes that the Secretary also has a reasonable basis for disallowing the taxpayer's treatment of such item.

“(B) 30-DAY LETTER.—The term ‘30-day letter’ means the first letter of proposed deficiency which allows the taxpayer an opportunity for administrative review in the Internal Revenue Service Office of Appeals.

“(4) RATE OF INTEREST.—The rate of interest allowable under this subsection shall be the Federal short-term rate determined under section 6621(b), compounded daily.

“(e) USE OF DEPOSITS.—

“(1) PAYMENT OF TAX.—Except as otherwise provided by the taxpayer, deposits shall be treated as used for the payment of tax in the order deposited.

“(2) RETURNS OF DEPOSITS.—Deposits shall be treated as returned to the taxpayer on a last-in, first-out basis.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 67 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 6603. Deposits made to suspend running of interest on potential underpayments, etc.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to deposits made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) COORDINATION WITH DEPOSITS MADE UNDER REVENUE PROCEDURE 84-58.—In the case of an amount held by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate on the date of the enactment of this Act as a deposit in the nature of a cash bond deposit pursuant to Revenue Procedure 84-58, the date that the taxpayer identifies such amount as a deposit made pursuant to section 6603 of the Internal Revenue Code (as added by this Act) shall be treated as the date such amount is deposited for purposes of such section 6603.

SEC. 203. PARTIAL PAYMENT OF TAX LIABILITY IN INSTALLMENT AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Section 6159(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to authorization of agreements) is amended—

(A) by striking “satisfy liability for payment of” and inserting “make payment on”, and

(B) by inserting “full or partial” after “facilitate”.

(2) Section 6159(c) of such Code (relating to Secretary required to enter into installment agreements in certain cases) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “full” before “payment”.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO REVIEW PARTIAL PAYMENT AGREEMENTS EVERY TWO YEARS.—Section 6159 of such Code is amended by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively, and inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) SECRETARY REQUIRED TO REVIEW INSTALLMENT AGREEMENTS FOR PARTIAL COLLECTION EVERY TWO YEARS.—In the case of an agreement entered into by the Secretary under subsection (a) for partial collection of a tax liability, the Secretary shall review the agreement at least once every 2 years.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to agreements entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on Mother's Day the Nation honored the love and daily sacrifices of our mothers in raising us and unstintingly giving of themselves both in the workforce and at home. Not just our mothers, but all women play an essential role in advancing our Nation's economic success and the American spirit, which is why it is so important to take the steps we can to enhance the Social Security benefits that are so crucial to women's retirement income security.

Many of the changes in the Social Security program over time were specifically designed to help women, such as the addition of the wives' and widows' benefits in 1939, mothers' benefits in 1950, divorced women's benefits in 1965, and disabled widows' benefits in 1967. By providing spouse and survivor benefits, lifetime inflation-adjusted benefits, and a progressive benefit formula, Social Security helps keep millions of women out of poverty today.

Although we face significant choices ahead in strengthening Social Security's financing for future generations, both Republicans and Democrats agree we must continue to enhance Social Security for women. The Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act is a critical first step both towards increasing women's retirement income security and in forming the building blocks of a bipartisan dialogue on how best to strengthen Social Security for all the American people.

H.R. 4069, as amended, takes a first step towards updating benefits and helping women meet their needs. This legislation will not affect Social Security's long-term financial picture, but it will make meaningful improvements for over 12,000 women when it is implemented.

The Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act increases benefits for certain widows, it allows more disabled widows to qualify for disabled widow benefits, and enables certain divorced spouses to avoid the unnecessary 2-year waiting for the benefits. These enhancements are particularly necessary because elderly and disabled widows and divorced spouses are more likely to live in poverty.

The subcommittee worked with the Social Security Administration to identify these benefit enhancements, and several women and senior organizations agreed these changes are an important start in updating Social Security to improve women's retirement securities. AARP said, "The bill targets improvements for widows and divorced spouses, and it will help ensure that Social Security continues to provide valuable economic support for older

women who rely on Social Security for much of their retirement income." Moreover, these provisions have solid bipartisan support.

Furthermore, this bill continues the subcommittee's traditional process of making sure benefits are not increased within the Social Security System at the expense of other retirees or workers. We insisted on that when we repealed the earnings penalty and enacted the Ticket to Work legislation. According to the Social Security actuaries, this bill succeeds in increasing benefits without affecting the financial picture for the program. That means that mothers and grandmothers can have better benefits but not at the expense of their daughters and their granddaughters.

Some have proposed not meeting this bipartisan tradition, proposing even more expansive increases in women's benefits, but without addressing Social Security's financial challenges. To pay for the benefits, the general income tax receipts are transferred into Social Security in an amount that would be available if we increase the top tax rate. But we have not, and that means some other family worker or business would have to pay the bill sooner or later.

There is more we need to do for women, and we will. The President's bipartisan commission proposed increasing widows' benefits and guarantees that minimum-wage workers do not retire into poverty. My legislation, the Social Security Guarantee Plus Act, saves Social Security for 75 years and beyond; and it includes provisions to increase widows' benefits, reduces the penalty women pay who temporarily leave work to care for young children, expands eligibility for young disabled widows and divorced spouses, and reduces the government pension offset. Other Members of Congress have also introduced plans that directly enhance women's benefits.

Many of our Nation's mothers and seniors depend upon Social Security for much or all of their retirement income. One of the best ways to honor the women of America is to continue our long-standing tradition of enhancing Social Security for women and other vulnerable seniors and sow the seeds of cooperation rather than harvest the chaff of political acrimony. I ask that we all vote in favor of H.R. 4069.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD a statement that provides additional information about these enhancements for women and how they were developed, as well as letters of support we received from AARP, Independent Women's Forum, National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, United Seniors Association, Women Impacting Public Policy, and Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT ENHANCEMENTS FOR WOMEN ACT OF 2002

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

The Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act of 2002 improves fairness and

updates benefit eligibility requirements, resulting in higher benefits and expanded eligibility for certain elderly and disabled widows and divorced spouses, who are among the most likely to live in poverty.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Historically, women depend more on Social Security than do men for their retirement income. Women represent 58 percent of all aged Social Security beneficiaries, and approximately 71 percent of beneficiaries age 85 and older. On average, Social Security provides about half of total income for unmarried women (including widows) age 65 and older, and it is the only source of retirement income for 26 percent of unmarried elderly women. Social Security provides a crucial safety net for women's income security—without Social Security over half of elderly women would live in poverty.

There are several aspects of Social Security that are particularly important to women. At birth, women are expected to live almost 6 years longer than men. At age 65, women are expected to live about 3 years longer than men. Social Security protects women by providing lifetime, inflation-adjusted benefits to workers and their survivors, which help protect them from falling into poverty throughout their retirement as assets are spent down, other sources of pension income fail to keep pace with inflation, or after a spouse dies.

In addition to living longer, women tend to earn less than men. In 2000, the median weekly earnings for female full-time wage and salary workers were \$491, or 76% of the \$646 for their male counterparts. Social Security's progressive benefit formula protects women by replacing a higher percentage of earnings for low-wage workers than for high-wage workers.

Another reason women earn less than men over their lifetimes is time spent outside the workforce caring for children or other family members. Of workers first receiving benefits in 1999, women worked a median of 32 years, while men worked a median of 44 years. The difference in time spent in the workforce is projected to narrow in the future, but women are still expected to work fewer years than men on average because of family-care responsibilities. Social Security protects women who have less labor force participation and lower wages than their spouse by paying spousal benefits.

Although vital to women's economic security, some aspects of the Social Security program have not kept pace with changes in women's participation in the workforce and trends in marriage and child-care. For example: two-earner couples receive lower benefits than one-earner couples with the same total earnings and age at retirement; parents who take time out of the workforce to care for a child receive no credit toward retirement benefits for those years; and a person must have been married 10 years to qualify for benefits as a divorced spouse, even though the median length of a marriage ending in divorce is around 7 years. Numerous proposals have been made to update and improve Social Security benefits for women, ranging from minor adjustments to spouse, divorced spouse, and survivor benefits, to credits for years spent caring for young children.

While many proposals to strengthen Social Security for women would reduce Social Security's long-term ability to pay benefits and are best considered as part of comprehensive legislation to strengthen Social Security, there are a number of ways to remedy current inequities in benefits and eligibility criteria with only a negligible effect on Social Security's finances. Once implemented, H.R. 4069 would improve benefits for

over 120,000 Americans according to estimates by the Congressional Budget Office, by improving benefits for divorced spouses and certain elderly and disabled widows.

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION

The Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security held hearings on February 3, 1999, February 28, 2002, and March 6, 2002 devoted to the topic of the need to enhance Social Security benefits for women. In the course of these hearings 31 witnesses provided testimony regarding the importance of maintaining and improving Social Security benefits for women. These hearings included testimony from the Commissioner of Social Security, the General Accounting Office, Members of Congress, and experts on women's issues. In addition, witnesses at hearings on Social Security's long-term financing challenges and options to address those challenges have discussed the unique needs of women and the particular importance of spouse's and survivors benefits, the progressive benefit formula, and lifetime inflation-adjusted benefits.

The Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security worked with the Social Security Administration to identify provisions that would help improve benefits for women without negatively affecting the Social Security Trust Funds. The provisions included in this bill generated strong bipartisan support. On March 20, 2002 Mr. Shaw, on behalf of himself and Mr. Matsui, Mr. Becerra, Mr. Brady of Texas, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Collins, Mr. Doggett, Ms. Dunn, Mr. Foley, Mr. Hayworth, Mr. Houghton, Mr. Lewis of Kentucky, Mr. McCrery, Mr. McNulty, Mr. Pomeroy, Mr. Portman, Mr. Ramstad, and Mr. Rangel introduced H.R. 4069, the Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act of 2002.

These provisions serve both to enhance women's retirement income security and as the first steps toward a bipartisan dialogue on ways to strengthen Social Security for all Americans, and are supported by women's advocacy and senior's organizations, including AARP, Independent Women's Forum, National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, United Seniors, Women Impacting Public Policy, and Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS AND COMPARISON WITH CURRENT LAW

SECTION 2. REPEAL OF 7-YEAR RESTRICTION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR WIDOW'S AND WIDOWER'S INSURANCE BENEFITS BASED ON DISABILITY

PRESENT LAW

A disabled surviving spouse (including a disabled surviving divorced spouse in some cases) of a deceased insured worker can be paid monthly benefits if the surviving spouse is age 50-59 and becomes disabled before the latest of: Seven years after the month the worker died; seven years after the last month the surviving spouse was previously entitled to benefits on the worker's earnings record as a surviving spouse with child in care; or seven years after the month a previous entitlement to disabled widow(er)s benefits ended because the disability of the widow(er) ended.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISION

This provision would eliminate this time requirement for entitlement as a disabled surviving spouse or disabled surviving divorced spouse.

REASON FOR CHANGE

The current law provision leaves gaps in the protection of some disabled widow(er)s, because the 7-year period may not afford all of them adequate opportunity to qualify for disability benefits based on their own work history. Eliminating the 7-year deadline

would improve the benefit protection for disabled widow(er)s who currently fail to meet criteria for the current 7-year deadline, regardless of whether they qualify for disability benefits based on their own work history. For those widow(er)s who are able to qualify for benefits based on their own work history, it would improve protection by allowing them to get potentially higher survivor benefits.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Effective for benefits for months beginning after November 2002.

SECTION 3. EXEMPTION FROM 2-YEAR WAITING PERIOD FOR DIVORCED SPOUSE'S BENEFITS UPON OTHER SPOUSE'S REMARRIAGE

PRESENT LAW

If a worker has reached age 62 and is eligible to receive Social Security benefits (but has not applied for them), his or her divorced spouse can become entitled to divorced spouse benefits based on the worker's earnings record if the divorced spouse meets all the following conditions: The divorced spouse is age 62 or older; the divorced spouse is not married; the divorced spouse had been married to the worker for at least 10 years before the date the divorce became final; the divorced spouse has filed an application for divorced spouse benefits; the divorced spouse is not entitled to a retired or disabled worker benefit based on a primary insurance amount that equals or exceeds one-half the worker's primary insurance amount; and the divorced spouse has been divorced from the worker for at least two years.

In addition, if the worker is subject to the earnings test, divorced spouse benefits would be commensurately reduced, unless the divorced spouse meets the aforementioned conditions.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISION

Under the provision, if the worker remarries someone other than the divorced spouse, then the duration of divorce condition is deemed to be met as the date of the remarriage.

REASON FOR CHANGE

The 2-year waiting period was included as part of a provision enacted in 1983 that allows divorced spouses to collect benefits as the former spouse of a worker who is eligible for Social Security benefits, but who has not applied for them or is having benefits withheld because of the earnings test. In contrast, a married spouse cannot receive spousal benefits unless the worker is also receiving benefits, and may have spousal benefits reduced if the worker is subject to the earnings test. The 2-year waiting period was included to discourage couples from divorcing in order to circumvent restrictions on spousal benefits. However, the waiting period is not appropriate in cases where the worker remarries someone else.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Effective for benefits for months beginning after November 2002.

SECTION 4. MONTHS ENDING AFTER DECEASED INDIVIDUAL'S DEATH DISREGARDED IN APPLYING EARLY RETIREMENT RULES WITH RESPECT TO DECEASED INDIVIDUAL FOR PURPOSES OF LIMITATION ON WIDOW'S AND WIDOWER'S BENEFITS

PRESENT LAW

Under present law, the benefits of a widow or widower are subject to a limitation if the deceased spouse had become entitled to retired worker benefits before attaining the normal retirement age. This limitation, referred to as the widow(er)'s limit, restricts the widow(er)'s benefit to the benefit amount the deceased worker would have been receiving if still alive (but not less than 82.5 per-

cent of the primary insurance amount). The intent of the widow(er)'s limit is to maintain some degree of reduction in the benefits of the surviving spouse as a result of the deceased worker having become entitled to benefits before attaining the normal retirement age. If the deceased spouse's death occurs before the normal retirement age, no adjustment to the number of reduction months is made in computing the widow(er)'s limit to account for months the worker did not receive benefits due to the worker's death. (However, such an adjustment is made to the widow(er)'s limit to account for months the worker did not receive benefits due to earnings exceeding the exempt amount under the retirement earnings test.)

EXPLANATION OF PROVISION

Under this provision, if the deceased spouse's death occurs after he or she becomes entitled to a retired worker benefit and before he or she attains the normal retirement age, the widow(er) limit would be recomputed at the time the deceased spouse would have reached the normal retirement age. The recomputation of the widow(er) limit would exclude the month of death and all subsequent months in determining the number of months of early retirement reduction applicable for the benefit the deceased worker would be receiving if still alive. This would give the widow(er) a potentially higher benefit based on the deceased worker's earnings history.

REASON FOR CHANGE

In general, widow(er)'s benefits are limited to reflect the longer period of time the worker received benefits because he or she retired before attaining the normal retirement age. However, the widow(er)'s benefits are limited for the rest of his or her life, even, if the deceased spouse collected benefits only for a few months before dying. This results in unequal treatment of widow(er)s whose spouses received benefits for the same amount of time before they attained the normal retirement age, but who retired at different ages. This provision would base the widow(er) limit on the number of months the worker actually received benefits between the age of retirement and the normal retirement age, rather than the number of months between the age of retirement and the normal retirement age, thus equalizing treatment of widow(er)s of workers who collected benefits for the same number of months before the normal retirement age. (Also, this change is consistent with the way that the widow(er)'s limit is now adjusted to exclude months before normal retirement age in which the worker did not receive benefits due to earnings exceeding the exempt amount under the retirement earnings test.)

EFFECTIVE DATE

Effective for benefits for months beginning after November 2002.

AARP,

Washington, DC, April 18, 2002.

Hon. E. CLAY SHAW, Jr.,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Social Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHAW: AARP supports H.R. 4069, the Social Security Benefit Enhancements Act of 2002. The bill's targeted improvements for widows and divorced spouses will help ensure that Social Security continues to provide valuable economic support to older women who rely on Social Security for much of their retirement income.

The Association has long championed improved benefits for older women that are consistent with the program's long-term solvency needs. Over a decade ago, in hearings before this subcommittee regarding older

women and Social Security, we testified in favor of eliminating the requirement that widow/ers become disabled within seven years after their spouse died to qualify for disabled widows benefits. We are pleased that the change has been included in H.R. 4069. The proposed readjustment in the benefits of widows whose spouse retires and dies before reaching the age for collecting full benefits and the provision waiving the two-year waiting period for benefits for a divorced spouse whose former mate continues working but remarries are also long overdue.

The Social Security Benefits Enhancement Act will help Social Security continue as the guaranteed floor of income protection for workers and their families. The bill has broad, bipartisan support, and we urge prompt House action.

AARP will urge the Senate to adopt similar legislation to improve women's benefits under the current system. Enactment of this legislation would send a strong message to the American people that Congress can act in a bipartisan fashion to improve the Social Security system.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. NOVELLI.

UNITED SENIORS ASSOCIATION—NEW SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION A “REAL WINNER FOR WOMEN”

WASHINGTON, DC.—United Seniors Association Chairman and Chief Executive Charles W. Jarvis wholeheartedly endorsed the Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act, H.R. 4069, recently introduced by Congressman Clay Shaw, the chairman of the House Ways & Means Social Security Subcommittee.

“This bill is a real winner for Senior women. It shows Chairman Clay Shaw’s dynamic leadership in the House on Senior issues,” said Mr. Jarvis. “It will lift unnecessary burdens that women suffer under during their retirement years. It will also help women nationwide without negatively affecting the Social Security Trust Fund and the future financial stability of the Social Security system.”

United Seniors Association member Anna Janis of Colorado testified February 28th before Chairman Shaw’s Subcommittee hearing on “Women and Social Security”. Chairman Shaw’s legislation is the direct result of those successful hearings. H.R. 4069 improves fairness and eligibility requirements for women by: Increasing the unfair benefit limit on widows whose spouses both retire and die before the full retirement age; updating the eligibility requirements for disabled widows to ensure consistency with earnings requirements in current law; eliminating a needless two-year wait for some divorced spouses to receive benefits.

“We’re pleased that United Seniors Association and our Grassroots Leader, Anna Janis, could help in the development of these improvements to Social Security,” continued Mr. Jarvis. “Chairman Shaw has demonstrated his dedication to getting practical help for seniors in his District and around the Nation. H.R. 4069 is clearly a real winner for many senior women who struggle every day now just to make ends meet.”

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2002.

Hon. CLAY SHAW,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Social Security,
Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I wish to express our sup-

port for the three provisions contained in your legislation, H.R. 4069 the Social Security Benefit Enhancements of Women’s Act.

We understand that H.R. 4069 would improve benefits for widows of early retirees who die before reaching the Normal Retirement Age by repealing the current provision that subjects the widow’s benefit to the early retirement penalty.

Your bill would also repeal the 7-year period of eligibility for disabled widows who are at least 50 but not yet 60. Under a current law a widow must be at least 60 years old to collect widows benefits. However if she is at least 50 she can collect benefits as a disabled widow provided that she became disabled within 7 years of her spouse’s death.

Finally H.R. 4069 would eliminate the requirement that a divorce must have been in place for two years for the divorced spouse who is at least 62 to collect full spousal benefits, whether or not the working spouse is collecting benefits or is affected by the earnings limit.

Over 100,000 women will benefit from these three important improvements. We sincerely hope these are the beginning steps in efforts to rectify benefit inequities affecting all women. For those it does help the improvements are most welcome.

We appreciate your leadership on this issue. We urge all members to vote in support of H.R. 4069.

Cordially,

BARBARA KENNELLY,
President and CEO.

WOMEN’S INSTITUTE FOR A SECURE RETIREMENT,
Washington, DC, April 4, 2002.

Hon. E. CLAY SHAW, Chair,
Hon. ROBERT T. MATSUI, Rnk. Mem.,
House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES SHAW AND MATSUI: The Women’s Institute for a Secure Retirement (WISER) is a non-profit organization that seeks to ensure that poverty among older women will be reduced by improving the opportunities for women to secure retirement benefits. WISER works with community based organizations, advocates and policymakers to provide a key link between federal policy and individual women.

We are gratified that you are introducing the Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act of 2002 during this session to improve benefits for elderly women. While the provisions of H.R. 4069 are modest, the 120,000 older women who will become eligible for benefits or receive higher benefits are the women who are the most likely to live in poverty—widows, disabled widows and divorced women.

Poverty among the elderly has greatly declined over the last two decades, but older women living alone are particularly at risk. Today, nearly 60 percent of older women in America are single; 45.3 percent are widowed and 7 percent are divorced. In contrast, only 26 percent of elderly men are unmarried.

We are heartened that the introduction of H.R. 4069 may be the first step toward enhancing Social Security benefits to ensure the long-term economic security of American women. We urge your colleagues to support this bill to improve Social Security benefits for older widows, disabled widows and divorced spouses.

Sincerely,

CINDY HOUNSELL,
Executive Director.

WOMEN IMPACTING PUBLIC POLICY,
Oklahoma City, OK, April 19, 2002.

Hon. E. CLAY SHAW, Jr.,
House of Representatives, Chairman, Subcommittee on Social Security, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHAW: We are writing to inform you that the more than 250,000 members of Women Impacting Public Policy (WIPP) support H.R. 4069, The Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act of 2002.

H.R. 4069 addresses several key issues that have long been of major concern to WIPP members: Increasing the unfair benefit limits on widows whose spouses both retire and die before the full retirement age; updates eligibility requirements for disabled widows to ensure consistency with earnings requirements in current law and; eliminates a needless two-year wait for some divorced spouses to receive benefits.

WIPP member Niesha Wolfe, a CPA based in Clarkesville, Tennessee, provided compelling testimony before your committee in February on these issues and others related to the unfair Social Security benefits women have been subject to for years.

WIPP, a national bi-partisan public policy organization, appreciates your efforts and fully supports H.R. 4069.

Regards,

TERRY NEESE,
President.
BARBARA KASOFF,
Vice President.

INDEPENDENT WOMEN’S FORUM,
Arlington, VA, May 6, 2002.

Hon. E. CLAY SHAW,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, Subcommittee on Social Security, Rayburn House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHAW: The Independent Women’s Forum strongly believes in comprehensive reform to strengthen our Social Security system and to make safe the retirement of America’s working women and men.

In February, I had the opportunity to appear before you and the House Subcommittee on Social Security to affirm the need for overall reform and to discuss some current inequities in the system. I specifically pointed out that women are financially disadvantaged under the current Social Security system. Women who interrupt their careers for family obligations, women who earn more than their husbands, and widows of wage earners fall into these disadvantaged categories.

You are attempting to correct inequities toward women through the introduction of H.R. 4069, the Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act of 2002. We commend you, Mr. Chairman, for your recognition of these and other problems; and we hope that your leadership will show the way to a newly reformed and significantly strengthened Social Security system.

Sincerely,
NANCY MITCHELL PFOTENHAUER,
President.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

First of all, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from the State of Florida, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means, for bringing forth this bill; and I appreciate the fact that he has taken the opportunity to do so. I think it is a step in the right direction.

Obviously, the bill before us today is a good piece of legislation. It will, in fact, increase benefits for 120,000 additional widows, basically widows in which the other spouse, the spouse that passed away, took early retirement. It deals with widows who have become disabled. It obviously deals with widows that were divorced in terms of shortening the time in which they may be able to collect benefits. So this is a good piece of legislation.

Obviously, we can do more; and I introduced a bill 2 weeks ago that would actually provide greater benefits. Instead of 120,000 widows, our bill would in fact cover and increase benefits for 4.7 million additional widows by guaranteeing these widows a 75 percent benefit of what they previously had when both spouses were alive.

Right now, under the Social Security Act, widows receive only about 50 to 65 percent of what they received when the other spouse was still alive. We all know from studies that when one spouse dies, even though the income goes down, the day-to-day fixed costs, like rent, like house payments, like food, remain very high. In fact, we estimate that the average cost is about 80 percent of what they expended prior, when they were both living.

So when one spouse dies, it does not drop to 50 percent, it only drops down by 20 percent. So 80 percent of the expenditures still exist. Our bill would basically give every widow in America at least 75 percent of what both spouses had before one of the spouses passed away. So this is a guaranteed benefit.

This bill that we would like to offer today as an amendment, as I said, would take care of 4.7 million widows instead of 120,000. Unfortunately, because of the way the situation has been set up, this being a suspension calendar, we cannot offer that amendment.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, I did offer it in subcommittee. It failed on a partisan vote. Five Democrats voted for it; seven Republicans voted against it. It was never taken to the full committee, so we could not bring it there for a vote; and now we are left without an opportunity to bring it again for a vote. It is unfortunate.

The bill of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) does move us in the right direction. It picks up 120,000 widows and increases their benefits, so we are all going to support it. But by the same token, I wish we would have had an opportunity to vote on the bill that I had introduced.

The bill that I introduced is being supported by the National Council of Women's Organization, an umbrella group of 150 women's organizations, the AFL-CIO, the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, and the National Women's Legal Consortium. All of these groups support our legislation.

If I may just conclude, one of the problems that I have, I might make

this observation, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) raised his privatization legislation. He says that he has embodied the terms of his legislation in that bill. I have to say that one of the concerns that I have and the reason we should pass the bill that takes care of 4.7 million widows in America today is once we move down the road to privatization after the November election, we are going to be cutting benefits. The gentleman's bill will cost over the next 20 years \$8 trillion in general fund monies going into the Social Security system. We do not have that. We do not have even a trillion dollars in general fund money available. How are we going to come up with \$8 trillion in general fund money? That being the case, there is no question. We are going to be cutting Social Security benefits if we adopt a bill like the gentleman's or adopt one of the three President's bills that he came up with during the commission discussion.

As a result of that, we need to take care of these widows today. We will not take care of them when we do Social Security reform if in fact we move as the President wants to move in the direction of privatization of Social Security. That will not take care of these widows. As a matter of fact, it will result in significant massive benefit cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD letters in support of my legislation.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE
SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2002.

Hon. ROBERT MATSUI,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MATSUI: On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I wish to express our support for the provisions contained in your legislation, The Social Security Widow's Benefits Guarantee Act.

We are pleased that your legislation would increase the current benefit for surviving spouses to 75 percent of the combined benefit received by two spouses when both were living. Under current law, widows are effectively limited to 50-67 percent of what the couple had been receiving jointly. This change would have a dramatic positive impact on benefits for as many as 5 million Americans who are overwhelmingly women. As you know, four out of ten older women rely on Social Security for over 90 percent of their income.

Thank you for your leadership on this issue. We look forward to working with you to advance this legislation in the 107th Congress.

Cordially,

BARBARA KENNELLY,
President and CEO.

NWLC URGES SUPPORT FOR INCREASES IN
WOMEN'S SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

(WASHINGTON, D.C.) The National Women's Law Center praised a bill introduced by Congressman Robert T. Matsui today to improve Social Security benefits for widows and widowers. The proposal, which draws upon NWLC recommendations to Congress, would increase benefits for surviving spouses and reduce poverty among widows, the largest group of poor elderly women.

"The bill introduced by Congressman Matsui would strengthen and improve Social Security for women. These improvements could be funded through savings that would result from freezing just one of the future tax cuts scheduled for the wealthiest Americans. The issue is one of priorities: to help elderly widows or give more tax breaks to millionaires. As Mother's Day approaches, we hope that members of Congress will think about the choices they are making," said Joan Entmacher, NWLC Vice President and Director of Family Economic Security.

Matsui's bill would increase Social Security benefits for surviving spouses to 75 percent of the couple's prior combined benefit. Currently, widows and widowers receive a benefit equal to 100 percent of the late spouse's benefit (if that is higher than their own benefit), which amounts to between 50 and 67 percent of the couple's prior combined benefit. The increase in survivor benefits would be capped to target those most in need, and is estimated to help about four to five million widows and widowers. The bill would finance the improvements with general revenue transfers.

Savings from not implementing future cuts in the top income tax rate would fully pay for these improvements. The top rate affects fewer than one percent of taxpayers, those with average incomes of \$1 million a year. The median income of widows and other non-married women 65 and older is about \$12,000 per year.

In addition to the increase in survivor benefits, the bill includes three much smaller benefit improvements to help certain disabled and elderly widows and divorced spouses. These smaller reforms are also included in a bill introduced in March by Congressmen Clay Shaw and Robert Matsui with bipartisan support.

"Poverty among the elderly is overwhelmingly a women's problem, and a majority of poor elderly women are widows. Increasing Social Security survivor benefits would significantly help this large and economically vulnerable group of women," said Entmacher.

ALLIANCE FOR
RETIRED AMERICANS,
Washington, DC, May 7, 2002.

Hon. ROBERT MATSUI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MATSUI: The Alliance for Retired Americans supports your legislation, the Social Security Widow's Benefit Guarantee Act.

Your legislation will correct the inequities that millions of Americans who have lost their spouses now face under the Social Security system. Nearly 5 million American widows and widowers currently live in poverty. This is a national scandal that must be corrected. By adjusting the Social Security benefit rates that widows and widowers will receive, your legislation will directly improve the quality of life for millions of older Americans.

The Alliance for Retired Americans stands ready to work with you so that this legislation can become law as quickly as possible. Sincerely yours,

EDWARD F. COYLE,
Executive Director.

LEADING WOMEN'S GROUPS SUPPORT THE
"WIDOW'S SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT GUARANTEE ACT OF 2002"

[WASHINGTON, DC, May 7, 2001].—The National Council of Women's Organizations (NCWO), the oldest and largest umbrella coalition of the nation's 150 major women's groups, announces its support for legislation

to strengthen Social Security for widows. The important bill is being introduced today by Congressman Robert T. Matsui (D-CA), Ranking Member of the House Ways and Means Social Security Subcommittee. The Matsui bill will improve survivor's benefits (most often for widows who outlive their husbands) by increasing benefits to 75 percent of what the couple had been receiving prior to the spouse's death. Raising this limit from the current 50-67 percent will aid an estimated five million elderly survivors.

"Without Social Security, over half of elderly women would be poor" said Heidi Hartmann, Ph.D., Chair of NCWO's Social Security Task Force. "NCWO has long supported Social Security benefit improvements to ensure that our nation's most vulnerable individuals are secure in their senior years. The Matsui bill is an important first step."

In addition, the bill includes provisions that eliminate the 7-year deadline for a surviving spouse or surviving divorced spouse to qualify for benefits on the basis of disability. It also treats the months the retired worker was deceased prior to the normal retirement age the same as months benefits were withheld or reduced because of the retirement earnings test for purposes of adjusting the limitation on widows and widowers benefits. Finally, it waives the two-year duration of divorce requirements if worker remarries during that time. These provisions will help 120,000 people.

STATEMENT BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT JOHN J. SWEENEY IN SUPPORT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY WIDOW'S BENEFIT GUARANTEE ACT OF 2002, MAY 7, 2002

One out of every seven elderly widows in this country lives in poverty, in spite of Social Security. These are women who worked their whole lives supporting their families in paid and unpaid work, raising children and grandchildren and caring for loved ones. Shortchanging widows is not consistent with the fundamental purposes of Social Security, and it is high time we fix the problem.

We strongly support the Social Security Widow's Benefit Guarantee Act introduced by Representative Matsui today. His bill would address the critical needs of these women. Most importantly, it increases the widow benefits under Social Security to 75 percent of what a couple's total benefit is before a husband dies, up to \$1,000 per month. Under current law, some widows get as little as half of the couple's benefit and none get more than two-thirds of the combined benefit. Rep. Matsui's bill addresses this shortfall in Social Security by increasing benefits for approximately 5 million elderly.

Congress could more than pay for these new protections by capping future income tax cuts for the highest income earners. For example, freezing the top federal income tax rate at 38.6 percent would be enough to provide increased benefits for widows. Under the terms of last year's tax cut legislation, the top income tax rate was lowered from 39.6 percent and is scheduled to fall farther to 35 percent by 2006. This part of the Bush tax cut benefits only the wealthiest individuals, affecting just the top 0.6 percent of taxpayers. They make, on average, more than \$1 million a year. That's more than 133 times a poverty-level income for an elderly widow.

With Representative Matsui's bill, Congress has a chance to get its values straight. American voters don't want more tax cuts for millionaires—such as the Republican leadership in the House pushed through last month—and they don't want politicians to gamble with their retirement security—such as the Administration would do by draining trillions of dollars out of Social Security to pay for privatization. Congress should do the

right thing, and support the Social Security Widow's Benefit Guarantee Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has a copy of my bill. The gentleman has critiqued my bill. The gentleman has been asked to give constructive comment to my bill. Now what we are talking about is not the bill before this committee, but when we start hearing the word privatization, the gentleman knows full well there are those in this House that will abuse the word privatization. Privatization is simply defined as taking something run by the government and turn it over to the private sector.

The gentleman from California knows full well that my Social Security reform bill leaves the Social Security system totally intact. We take not one dime out of the Social Security trust fund or the payroll taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, so there is no misconception here, that the Social Security Administration under two Presidents, a Democrat and a Republican, estimate that by doing nothing, the cost of doing nothing which is the only bill that I have heard coming from the other side to save Social Security, is going to cost \$27 trillion over 75 years. Whereas the Social Security Administration, assuming that we borrow all of the money necessary to make up the shortfall in Social Security under my particular bill, that it will all be paid back and over that 75 years will create a \$1 trillion surplus. Which does the gentleman want? It is time that we work together.

There are those in this body that absolutely shamelessly use the word privatization when we are not going to privatize Social Security. Mr. Speaker, as long as I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security, it is not going to be privatized; but we are desperately looking for some assistance from other side of the aisle. We need constructive engagement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and thank him for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today. I also thank the ranking member for supporting this bill. We recognize this is a first step, and it is a good first step.

I rise in support of H.R. 4069, the Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act of 2002. This bill makes commonsense corrections to Social Security law that will benefit widows, disabled widows, and divorced spouses. Social Security has been one of our Nation's greatest success stories, and particularly so for women. Women make up roughly half of America's population, yet they account for more than 60 percent of the Social Security beneficiaries. Three-quarters of the unmar-

ried and widowed elderly women rely on Social Security for more than half of their income. This legislation will help. The annual cost-of-living adjustment often does not amount to a great deal of money per recipient. However, it is often a crucial sum for seniors trying to keep up with escalating costs, particularly medical ones.

Once implemented, this bill will help over 120,000 women. This may not sound like a large number, but the bill is going to touch the lives of more than 275 people in each of our 435 congressional districts. Even if it helps one, that is great. This will help 120,000-plus. Social Security must be strengthened for the future. It must be done in a bipartisan fashion, and passage of legislation of shared concern like this bill is a very good place to start.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the bill the gentleman has is a privatization bill. The gentleman can call it anything he wishes, but it is a privatization bill.

Dr. Peter Orszag, a professor at the University of California Berkeley, currently at the Brookings Institute, has studied the gentleman's bill, the DeMint-Armey bill and the three proposals presented by the President through his commission; he said all of them are privatization bills.

What the bill of the gentleman from Florida does, it deals with arbitrage. Money is borrowed at 6 percent, and then is lent out at 10 percent. We all know arbitrage is a huge risk, and it could blow up. Once Americans have these privatization accounts, then there is a claw back. When they are ready to retire, they have to give 95 percent of the money that is accumulated to put back into the Social Security Administration. If in fact the arbitrage falls apart, the money will not be there. It is jeopardizing the Social Security system. In addition, it is a private account that is being set up that affects the Social Security benefits. So it is a privatization plan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of improving Social Security benefits for women, all women in this country. That is one of the reasons why I support the legislation today of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). But we should be clear, this modest improvement in Social Security benefits for women should be considered nothing more than a downpayment of what we must do to help women who for years have worked very hard in and out of the home, in and out of the office, in and out of all of the workplaces of America, the chance to receive their fair share of retirement security.

Mr. Speaker, four out of every 10 women who are retired today rely on Social Security for 90 percent of all of their income. And 75 percent of all

women rely on Social Security for half of all of their income. Clearly Social Security is extremely important for women, more so than it is for men.

While we have done a tremendous job of decreasing poverty among our elderly, over the last 30 years or so we have seen a decrease of some 29 percent of poverty within the senior ranks in our country to something around 8.5 percent today of our seniors in poverty. When we look at widows, we find that their poverty rates are twice as much for the average senior in this country. We must do more.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I stand proudly to support the legislation of the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), H.R. 4671, which would give women, widows, widowers their fair share within Social Security retirement benefits. What the Matsui bill does, which the Shaw bill does not do, it covers in a meaningful way Americans who deserve to have a meaningful opportunity to retire in comfort and security; 5 million people would be affected by the Matsui bill. We have about 120,000 women who would be helped by the Shaw bill. We should do it, but we have millions more who are out there waiting to receive their due. It is time for us to do this.

We cannot do retirement security on the cheap. We cannot continue to say that we will place Social Security first among all our priorities and not do it the right way. We cannot continue to say that we believe men and women should be able to retire in safety and security without doing it the right way. It is time for us to do this. We should pass this legislation. It is not enough. We should have had hearings on the Matsui legislation because, quite honestly, the American people deserve to know that we will protect our men and women in their retirement.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN).

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say I do not know that anybody is not going to support this piece of legislation before us. What I do want to point out is this is a huge issue for a lot of people in and around this country. So often I have women who come to me because generally women live longer, who come to me and say my husband died, prescription drugs are going up. Everything is happening around me; and quite frankly, I cannot live on my Social Security alone. And I am not getting anything from my husband's Social Security.

The fact of the matter is, what concerns me most about this legislation today is there is going to be somebody who writes the story, and somebody is going to believe they are going to get something new or better than what they have gotten. The fact of the matter is, based on what I am seeing here, these are some very technical changes, changes that are not going to affect the same people that I think the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) and others, including myself, have in fact sponsored. We could actually be helping about 5 million elderly widows instead of a small portion.

I might just say it is my understanding that, and it is technical, it would eliminate the 7-year deadline for the onset of the disability in order to be eligible for benefits as a disabled widow or widower. The proposal would allow divorced spouses benefits to be paid before the 2-year period has elapsed if the former spouse has remarried, and the proposal would limit the widow's actual reduction to the number of months the worker usually received in benefits.

That is not the 5 million elderly widows and widowers that need the help. That is a very small amount of folks in this country. I think that is the real debate that we need to be having here and hopefully will happen in this committee. We have two very reasonable Members, but we have not had the opportunity to have the Matsui bill be heard.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing trends for women. The last 7 years of life, we live longer, we have personal health care needs, we are hearing in the committee about the overpricing of medicines, all of those things that they no longer can pay.

□ 1645

There are also more women in nursing homes. Certainly this would help defray some of their cost. I just think that while we will support this today, what I would encourage and hope is that the committee, the Subcommittee on Social Security, will not leave it just at what I consider to be technical changes but will look at the wide picture, the picture of widows and widowers out there that really do need our assistance. Quite frankly, these are the folks that have been coming to us day in and day out explaining the concerns and needs that they have. I just do not think this is going to do that.

I do want to say that I hope we, in fact, will have an opportunity to discuss this, and certainly with the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) and others, as to the importance of this whole issue on disability and Social Security and widowers' benefits.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN).

Mr. SANDLIN. I thank my good friend and colleague from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4069, the Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act. This bill will help more than 120,000 Social Security beneficiaries. We wish it could be more, something like 4.7 million beneficiaries. It will provide enhanced Social Security benefits to women by increasing benefits for certain widows, by permitting more disabled widows to qualify for disabled widow benefits, and by allowing certain

divorced spouses to receive their benefits sooner.

As has been indicated by my good friend from California, the Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act addresses the challenges women, and especially widows, face when it comes to Social Security. Women on average earn less than men throughout their lives and therefore have less to live on during their retirement years. The vast majority of Social Security beneficiaries are women. Women make up some 60 percent of all Social Security recipients over the age of 65 and roughly 72 percent of all beneficiaries over the age of 85. Additionally, women lose an average of 14 years of Social Security earnings because of time out of the workforce spent to raise children or to care for an ailing parent or an ailing spouse. Further, women generally have a higher incidence of part-time employment and therefore have less of an opportunity to save for retirement.

Mr. Speaker, Social Security is the cornerstone of our Nation's retirement system. This is especially true for women. Without these benefits, nearly three-fifths of women over the age of 75 in this country would live in poverty. If we privatized Social Security, we would undermine many of the benefits that women receive through the current system. A plan to privatize Social Security is a plan that will jeopardize women's Social Security benefits and will jeopardize the entire Social Security system.

Women live on average 6 to 8 years longer than men and therefore must make retirement savings stretch over longer periods of time. Women depend considerably upon Social Security's progressive, lifelong, inflation-indexed benefits. There is no plan to privatize Social Security that will safeguard account balances from erosion due to inflation. Privatizing Social Security would be a mistake for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the solvency of our Social Security system is at risk. More than 32 million Americans collect benefits from Social Security today.

Mr. Speaker, May is Older Americans Month. It is critically important for us to honor our older Americans and shore up Social Security.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I support the gentleman from Florida's legislation. I think it is a good piece of legislation. It will take care of 120,000 additional women and I think that is a step in the right direction. I only wish we had an opportunity to vote on my bill, as a number of speakers on my side of the aisle have indicated they would have liked that opportunity, because we think it is important to deal with this issue today given the fact that there is a lot of uncertainty out there of what might happen in 2003 after the election.

The President's people, Mr. Rove and others, have said that they do not want to bring this issue up this year, they want to bring it up in 2003 after the

election in terms of the whole issue of privatization. The real danger I see there is that once we embark upon that direction we are not going to be able to take care of these 4.7 million widows that my bill would take care of because we are going to be cutting benefits. I do not think there is any question about that.

The President's bill, for example, has three alternatives. One of the alternatives would require \$6 trillion of general fund moneys, which we do not have at this time. In addition, it would have 46 percent cuts in benefits over the next number of years in terms of recipients of Social Security. Each one of his proposals either requires an infusion of general fund moneys or cuts in benefits. The gentleman from Florida's bill is a riverboat gamble essentially.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic whip.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and I thank him for his leadership on this very important issue, for calling to our attention the distinction between the bill before us today, which we will all support, and what we could really be doing for widows in our country who are on Social Security.

Social Security is one of America's proudest achievements in social policy. No other program has brought so many people out of poverty, enabling millions to live with dignity. For millions of senior citizens, it is a lifeline. Unfortunately, the lifeline is severed for many when a spouse dies. H.R. 4069 takes a few small steps to improve benefits for widows, but its remedies leave millions of widows behind. The gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) has introduced legislation that comprehensively addresses this need. However, the Republican leadership did not follow the regular committee process and Democrats had no opportunity to strengthen the provisions of this bill on the floor today.

Given what the Republican budget does to the Social Security surplus, the small steps forward being proposed today are even less adequate. Both parties promised that protecting Social Security would be the top priority. Yet the Republicans' budget breaks that promise by spending \$1 trillion of the Social Security surplus over the next 5 years. The Republican plan to privatize Social Security would cost another \$1 trillion over the next decade.

Democrats have asked repeatedly for the opportunity to debate the Republican privatization plan and last month on this floor, it does not even seem like it has been last month, it seems like just a couple of weeks ago, every Democrat voted for a motion to say that the Republican proposal to make the tax cuts permanent could not proceed unless the Congressional Budget Office said that those tax cuts would not raid the Social Security Trust Fund. Every Democrat voted for that. Every Republican voted against it. The looming re-

tirement of the baby boom generation means that we cannot irresponsibly push this issue aside for another day.

This debate, like all debates on Social Security, has a disproportionate impact on women, who live 6 to 8 years longer than men on average and constitute 60 percent of Social Security recipients. Women continue to earn less on average than men and are less likely to have an employer-sponsored pension plan. Thus, the benefit structure of Social Security, which partially corrects disparities in income, is particularly important for women. Women are also more likely to work part-time and take time out of the workforce, 14 years on average, to raise their children and to care for ailing parents or spouses. As a result, they have less time to save for retirement.

Social Security must be protected for the elderly women who rely on it for their financial survival, and the concerns of women must be a priority in the ongoing discussion about how to preserve Social Security. That is why, of course, I will vote for what is on the floor today because approximately 120,000, 140,000 women will benefit, but let us not leave the millions of other widows behind whose needs would be addressed by the Matsui legislation.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will sum up by making one other observation. I see the gentleman from Florida has a pay-for in his legislation. His bill will cost \$4 billion over the next 10 years. The interesting thing about the pay-for, however, is that it comes directly out of the Taxpayer Bill of Rights legislation in which he used the same pay-fors to pay for the revenue offsets in the Taxpayer Bill of Rights which passed in the sunset bill about the middle of April.

In addition to that, I understand the bill that is coming up tomorrow, the welfare reform package, they are using the same offsets to pay for that as well. So it will be kind of interesting to see how they really use their pay-fors in order to actually make this bill fully funded.

I might just finally point out that our bill does not take any money out of the Social Security Trust Fund. It comes out of general revenues, the same general revenues that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have taken in October of last year when they passed their first GOP stimulus bill, in which 16 of the largest low-taxed corporations in America would have gotten an immediate tax break of \$7.4 billion basically that would have been retroactive 16 years of the alternative minimum tax. Altogether it was \$25 billion in tax reduction for major corporations in America that really do not need it, including \$254 million to Enron and \$1.4 billion to IBM. All of these would have received tax cuts without a pay-for. We would take our pay-for out of the same source that the gentleman would have given major tax cuts to.

I see he paid for his. On the other hand, it is coming from the Taxpayers Bill of Rights or tomorrow's welfare reform package, so I find it somewhat inconsistent in terms of where his pay-for is actually going to come from. We support this bill. We wish we could have had a vote on our bill in the form of an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would like to just comment briefly on the observation that the gentleman just made. There is an old saying that there are two things in life that are certain, one is death and the other is taxes. I think we can add to that the provision that bills are going to languish in the Senate and will not be taken up, so I would guess that these pay-fors are going to be used over and over again in this House until the Senate finally passes something, which the American people really would like to see them do and like to see us work together to do these things.

I would also like to say that this particular bill in the pay-for is a budget function. It does not take any general revenue and put it into the Social Security system as the gentleman from California's bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to at this time correct a figure that I gave the House earlier. I said that the cost of doing nothing was \$27 trillion. That figure is actually \$25 trillion over 75 years. When I look, and as I see and as I have heard and read from the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) and from the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), they do not think that we have to do anything. They do not think we have to forward fund Social Security. Let me just run a couple of statistics by the House. I hate to take this time on this particular bill because it is peripheral to it, but in that all of the benefits that the gentleman from California keeps talking about in his bill are in my Social Security bill or my bill to save Social Security, I think it does have some justification to be discussed and particularly since my Social Security bill has been discussed at length as a privatization bill, which it is clearly not.

When Social Security first came online many, many years ago, there were 40 some workers per retiree. Now we are down to a little over three. Soon it will be a little over two. A pay-as-you-go system has served us well and as long as we had a lot of workers at the bottom and few retirees at the top, it was fine. It worked great.

□ 1700

But now we know and the actuaries have told us, and now through the Democrat administration and the Republican administration they have advised us that there is a deficit pending in the Social Security System over the next 75 years of \$25 trillion. Mr. Speaker, that is a lot of money. That is

money that can bring down an entire economy.

So I say to my friend from California and other Members that think there is no need to do something, we are going to be faced with a dilemma and we had better start facing it. Do we want to cut benefits by one-third? I doubt it. But that is what we will have to do if we are going to keep the system going as a pay-as-you-go system.

Do we want to increase payroll taxes by 50 percent? I am sure we do not. But that is what we are going to have to do if you are going to maintain benefits and keep it as a pay-as-you-go system.

Or do we want to rack up a deficit of \$25 trillion over the next 75 years? I am not making these figures up. I do not come to this floor unprepared with these figures. It is a question of what the administration has said through the Social Security System, now through a Democrat and a Republican administration.

So I think it is time that we quit the talk about privatization, quit the talk about raiding the trust fund, all of these sorts of things. It is pure nonsense, because we do not raid the trust fund, because there is no money in the trust fund. There are only Treasury Bills, and you cannot raid the Treasury Bills.

I would also say that over the years when the Democrats controlled this House and the Senate and spending was very much in the red, that the Democrats did not raid the Social Security trust fund, because the system just does not work that way. But those are great words to really worry our seniors.

The seniors of this country have paid into a Social Security system as they know it today, and this Congress or no Congress should touch it. We should maintain the system and the integrity of the system as exactly what they have paid into.

However, it is time for us to begin to think ahead. If we do not want to raise payroll taxes, if we do not want to cut benefits, then we had better start planning ahead for the next generation, instead of just the next election. All we have heard about from the other side is the next election. Let us be responsible legislators and get together and save Social Security. Let us be concerned about our grandkids and our kids.

This is tremendously important. I think about every one of my 13 grandkids every time I think about where are we going to leave this country and this great retirement system. These little bitty kids are going to be seniors some day; they are going to be facing the possibility of poverty. They are going to pay into a Social Security system all of their working years.

They deserve better, Mr. Speaker. They deserve a responsible Congress that will go ahead and put all this rhetoric aside and reform Social Security. Unfortunately, I do not think we are going to see that until after this election, because there are some in this

House that would rather have the issue that might change the majority of this House rather than saving Social Security for their kids. That is a sad commentary, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I would like to end on a positive note and urge that all of the Members of this body vote "yes" on H.R. 4069 which is before this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would remind all Members that it is not in order to cast reflections on the Senate.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, but it is with my extreme disappointment.

Mr. Speaker, five million widows currently experience a drastic reduction of benefits of up to 50 percent after their spouse dies. The poverty rate remains a staggering 15 percent for widows. That is simply wrong. America's seniors should not have to be confronted with a dramatic reduction in their Social Security income at the same time their beloved spouse dies. It should not happen.

That is why we should be debating legislation today that would guarantee Social Security benefits for elderly widows. But we are not.

Instead, we are debating a totally inadequate Republican proposal that would cover only 125,000 widows. The Republicans would leave over four million widows—four out of ten of whom depend on Social Security for 90 percent of their income—with severely cut benefits.

But it is a small step in the right direction. Covering 125,000 widows is better than covering none, which is our only other alternative and which is why I will support this weak bill. But let's not fool ourselves into thinking it is enough. We could do more. Democrats want to do more.

Our substitute, which was not allowed to be considered today, would have helped approximately 4.5 million elderly people—one million of whom now live below the poverty level. It would have addressed this problem in a meaningful way that helps our seniors out of poverty.

Instead, the Republicans are trying to fool the electorate into think they care about this issue by offering something, anything. The fact is that the Republicans find no problem with denying over four million widows Social Security benefits while they look forward to spending \$8 trillion to privatize the system.

Mr. Speaker, we should be doing more.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation we are considering today, H.R. 4069, the Social Security Benefit Enhancements for Women Act of 2002.

This bill makes a modest attempt to address current deficiencies in the manner that Social Security compensates some widows.

The fact is that women are more likely than men to be dependent on Social Security for their retirement. Because of the kind of jobs they are more likely to hold, the responsibilities that they face with children and the work interruptions that result from family commitments, women tend to have lower earnings than men, are less likely to have pensions and therefore are more reliant upon Social Security for their retirement.

The bill we are considering today rectifies a few inequities in the system that are faced by certain widows whose benefits are unfairly reduced by the rigidity of the system. However, if the Majority wants to truly begin to address the failings in the system for widows we should be considering Representative MATSUI's more comprehensive legislation today—H.R. 4671, the Social Security Widow's Benefit Guarantee Act.

Representative MATSUI's bill, which I proudly cosponsored, would go much further than the bill on the floor and grant real retirement security for poor seniors by guaranteeing widows a benefit equal to 75 percent of the combined benefits the couple had been receiving prior to the death of the spouse.

Guaranteeing a livable retirement benefit for widows is critical because they tend to be overwhelmingly dependent on Social Security.

As a group, 75 percent of elderly non-married women, including widows, rely on Social Security for half of their income.

In the short-term these women deserve the guarantee Mr. MATSUI's bill would provide. In the long-term, we need to make sure benefits are available as promised and not risk the future of the system by privatizing it.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4069, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROHIBITING MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES IN SAUDI ARABIA FROM BEING REQUIRED OR COMPELLED TO WEAR THE ABAYA GARMENT

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4714) to prohibit members of the Armed Forces in Saudi Arabia from being required or formally or informally compelled to wear the abaya garment, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4714

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. WEAR OF ABAYAS BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN SAUDI ARABIA.

(a) PROHIBITION RELATING TO WEAR OF ABAYAS.—A member of the Armed Forces may not be required or formally or informally compelled to wear the abaya garment or any part of the abaya garment while in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia pursuant to a permanent change of station or orders for temporary duty.

(b) INSTRUCTION.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall provide each member of the Armed Forces ordered to a permanent

change of station or temporary duty in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia with instructions regarding the prohibition in subsection (a). Such instructions shall be provided to a member within 10 days before the date of a member's arrival at a United States military installation within the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia or immediately upon such arrival. The instructions shall be presented orally and in writing. The written instruction shall include the full text of this section.

(2) In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall act through the Commander in Chief, United States Central Command and Joint Task Force Southwest Asia, and the commanders of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps components of the United States Central Command and Joint Task Force Southwest Asia.

(c) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PROCUREMENT OF ABAYAS.—Funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may not be used to procure abayas for regular or routine issuance to members of the Armed Forces serving in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia or for any personnel of contractors accompanying the Armed Forces in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in the performance of contracts entered into with such contractors by the United States.

(d) COMMANDER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the commander of the United States Central Command may require the wear of the abaya garment in specific circumstances that, in the opinion of the commander, constitute an operational requirement essential for the conduct of the military mission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4714.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the bill offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. Speaker, this legislation establishes certain requirements relating to the wear of the abaya garment by Members of the U.S. Armed Forces in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. This bill represents a compromise bill on an amendment proposed during the markup of H.R. 4546, the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I think many Members feel the wearing of the abaya uniform by female service members should be entirely voluntary. I agree with that particular view. The pending legislation provides for such voluntary wear, except under specific circumstances that the Commander of the United

States Central Command may designate when the CINC determines that mandatory wear constitutes an operational requirement essential for the conduct of the military mission.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I explain the bill the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) and I wrote together and introduced today, I would like to thank the Members who made this possible.

From the moment I introduced language that prohibited the requiring or strongly encouraging our military women to wear abayas, both the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) and the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) were by my side. As we negotiated with the committee, maneuvered through the Committee on Rules, floor consideration and final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act, the three of us illustrated the power of bipartisanship and determination. I am truly honored to have worked with such knowledgeable and dedicated Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman MCHUGH) of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and the members of the Committee on Armed Services for their understanding and willingness to work with us to include this language in the defense bill. To clarify for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is the intent of the House that this language be included in the final defense bill that is passed by both Chambers and enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, one last thank you before I highlight the importance of this legislation, and that is my constituent, Lt. Colonel Martha McSally. Many of you know her as the first female fighter pilot to fly in combat, as well as leader in the effort to change the military's policy of requiring military servicewomen in Saudi Arabia to wear abayas. For 7 years this battle was fought. She is a remarkable person, whose patriotism is undeniable, integrity unquestionable, and determination to do what is right unparalleled. I am deeply honored to sponsor this legislation today to help Lt. Colonel McSally end this battle once and for all.

My colleagues have heard me say it numerous times before: women make first-class soldiers and should not be treated like second-class citizens. This bill we consider today will prohibit the military from requiring or formally or informally compelling servicewomen in Saudi Arabia to wear abayas and would block the military from making regular procurements of abayas.

This sends a very strong message. It says Congress will no longer tolerate forcing our dedicated military servicewomen who are on the front lines risking their lives, protecting and fighting for freedom and democracy and to defend Saudi Arabia itself to wear a religious garment of faith most of them do not follow.

As you can see from this picture, the abaya and head scarf cover the entire body from head to toe. Our female servicewomen stationed in Saudi Arabia are wearing this and having the most radical of Islamic beliefs imposed upon them, even though the Department of State does not require or encourage any of its employees to wear the abaya. It does not require its employees to wear abayas while on duty precisely because they are representing the United States of America. Not even the spouses and dependents of the State Department staff wear the abaya, nor did Mrs. Cheney or former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright during their visits to Saudi Arabia.

The Government of Saudi Arabia itself does not require non-Muslim women to wear abayas. My colleagues may be interested to know that even General Schwarzkopf did not issue any mandate requiring the servicewomen to wear abayas during the Gulf War. Male servicemembers are not required to wear the abaya, grow beards or embrace any Islamic religious beliefs in this way, so neither should women. Forcing our female service troops to wear the abaya has a negative impact on our recruitment and diminishes morale, unit cohesion and the chain of command headed by female servicemembers. Most of all, this practice is completely unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, this is about leadership. This is about sending a message to the world that America treats its citizens equally. And this message comes from the top. On November 17 of last year, President Bush launched a worldwide effort to focus on the brutality against women and children by the al Qaeda terrorist network and the Taliban. Under this regime, women were denied access to doctors and education and could not work outside the home or even leave the home by themselves.

This severe repression of women under the guise of religion masked an insidious discrimination that neither America nor many Muslims condone. In fact, most of the Islamic world recognizes women make important contributions to their societies. That is why America must affirmatively reject subjecting our military servicewomen to this discrimination and that is why I have fought to bring this bill to the floor today.

I urge my colleagues to join me, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), and the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) in passing this legislation and ending the demeaning practice of making only American servicewomen wear the abaya.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

(Mr. HOSTETTLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) in sponsoring H.R. 4714, a bill to prohibit members of the Armed Forces in Saudi Arabia from being required or formally or informally compelled to wear the abaya garment.

Present DOD policy of "strongly encouraging" our female military personnel to wear the abaya sure sounds like an order to me. Christians like Lt. Colonel Martha McSally should not be forced to wear a Muslim outfit, especially when off duty and on their own time.

I am puzzled by the fact that our female military personnel are treated like second-class citizens while stationed on soil they are defending from Iraqi aggression. As a matter of fact, the State Department does not require its female embassy employees to wear the abaya in Saudi Arabia. When Second Lady Lynne Cheney accompanied Vice President DICK CHENEY on his recent visit to Saudi Arabia, she did not wear an abaya; she wore a business suit.

It gets better. The Government of Saudi Arabia, according to their officials in the D.C. embassy, does not require foreigners to wear the abaya.

Forcing our female troops to wear the abaya in the past and now today strongly encouraging them to do so has a negative impact on our recruitment and retention of highly qualified military personnel.

How many well-trained, well-qualified military personnel have separated from the military to avoid wearing the abaya in Saudi Arabia? How many have not decided to enlist in our U.S. military in the first place to avoid ever being forced to wear the abaya?

The argument that women should wear the abaya for force protection begs the question what are we doing in any country if the best force protection measure is wearing an abaya?

Likewise, I believe Lt. Colonel McSally was right when she said, "When you separate your troops into two groups and then impose the values of the host nation on one of them, to me that is abandoning your American values."

This important legislation informs our allies that while our presence in their country is advantageous to their security, we are there not to defend their values, but the values of Americans. Some of those are women who have volunteered to put their lives on the line for our liberties.

The time is now for the Congress to take control of this issue, given our responsibilities under Article I, section 8 of our Constitution; and H.R. 4714 does just that. I should not have to remind anyone in this Congress about the plaque that hangs in the House Committee on Armed Services room which

reminds us, all of us, including officials from the Department of Defense, that according to our Founding Fathers, "The Congress shall have power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

□ 1715

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend Lieutenant Colonel Martha McSally for her courage in bringing this issue to the public's attention. For 6 years, she quietly tried to persuade the Pentagon to modify its policy with no success. She even discussed the issue with then Defense Secretary William Perry in 1995. In 2000, she lobbied then Secretary of the Air Force, Whit Peters. Moreover, she has written memos and met with top generals in the Air Force and still got nowhere.

It was not until she was questioned by a reporter for USA Today in April 2001 that she talked publicly about this policy, and I am glad she did. Otherwise, the Congress would probably still be in the dark about this religious liberty and quality of life issue for our female military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we take action to remedy this injustice now. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 4714.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), our esteemed ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, first let me say I appreciate and applaud the persistence of the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) in behalf of this legislation. It is the right thing to do. I appreciate the work of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) and the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) on this issue.

There was a phrase that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) used that is part of our Constitution. Mr. Speaker, the United States Constitution requires the Congress to raise and maintain the military and also to establish the rules and regulations thereof. Through my years in Congress, I have had the opportunity to do both and particularly, in writing rules and regulations insofar as military education is concerned and insofar as the structure of the military is concerned, which resulted in what we now call Goldwater-Nickles.

Mr. Speaker, this is the right thing to do. The Americans are in Saudi Arabia, have been in Saudi Arabia, were there to make sure that Saddam Hussein's troops did not come down south and into that country. They are there for the protection of that country. This is a very appropriate thing to do, to not make the American women of the military abide by anything but the American rules.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) for their leadership and their perseverance on this issue. This is a provision that probably should have been included in this year's defense authorization bill and may ultimately get rolled into that bill in conference, but without their perseverance we would not have been able to bring this bill to the floor of the House today.

It is my hope that the House tonight will send a very clear message to the Department of Defense that its policy on the wearing of the abaya, first making it mandatory and then strongly encouraging women service members in Saudi Arabia to wear the abaya, is completely unacceptable to this House and to the American people.

This bill, when passed, and I believe it will be passed and included in the defense authorization bill, or a stand-alone bill will pass the Senate, will end the DOD policy that affects American servicewomen serving in Saudi Arabia.

The sad thing is that this bill is needed at all. This policy should never have been put in place in the first place. When it was put in place and brought to the attention of senior commanders at the Pentagon, it should have been immediately repealed as transparently unconstitutional. Yet, it requires action by the United States House of Representatives in order to send a clear message to the Department of Defense that if they do not get it, we do, and they have to change this policy.

The Department of Defense changed its policy slightly by changing it from being mandatory to strongly encouraging American servicewomen to wear the abaya when off duty and off post in Saudi Arabia. Maybe that was clever from a public relations point of view, but for those of us who have served in the military, and I have, we know that "strongly encouraged" is not optional. When a senior officer tells a young service member that they are strongly encouraged to wear an abaya, that is about as close to an order as one can get. In fact, if one values one's military career, one will do it. If one values just one's freedom from hassles, from being labeled as a troublemaker or not a team player, it means one will do it, because it really means that one has to, because the commander says they are strongly recommending it. And they say that with a kind of tone in their voice that means, you do it or else.

It is those kinds of policies that we do not need in the United States military, and I think this goes beyond the issues of class, beyond issues of respect for women in positions of command. I believe that this is a first amendment issue.

The abaya is traditional Muslim garb. It is as inappropriate for the Department of Defense to order servicewomen to wear traditional Muslim garb, most of whom are Christians or Jewish who do not share the faith of women who choose to wear that dress, it is as inappropriate to do that as it is to tell servicemen serving in Israel that they must wear a yarmulke when they go to the Western Wall. Now, most servicemen would do so out of respect for the traditions of the country in which they are a resident. But it is inappropriate for the Department of Defense to force service members to wear religious clothing, pure and simple, and it is likewise inappropriate to strongly encourage that they do so.

This legislation is very clear in its language. It prohibits formally or informally compelling service members to wear the abaya. That covers all of the synonyms for "strongly encouraged" so that they could not just change it to "strongly recommend" or "highly recommend." They are prohibited from informally or formally compelling them. There is only one exception, and that exception is force protection. This House has rejected the DOD's spurious arguments about force protection, and that is exactly what they are.

The only exception is very narrowly crafted, and that is if it is essential to the conduct of the military mission and, in sitting on this floor with my colleagues and talking about what that might mean, if there was a serious civil unrest in Saudi Arabia and we had soldiers who are downtown in a building and we needed to extract them without local people knowing who they were, or for some reason for a special forces operation or to move people around, we may need to hide who our people really are. Those are the essential kinds of things that might justify such an order. Nothing else does.

I commend the gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentleman from Indiana for their leadership. This House will make a statement tonight that we will not tolerate this kind of policy from the Department of Defense, and we are strong enough and united enough to stand up for them.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his leadership on this important issue, and the gentlewoman from New Mexico also, who served in the military and who brings a great deal of knowledge and understanding to this issue. I thank her for her very impassioned statement before Congress today.

Our country is at war. Our troops overseas are risking their lives to protect our lives and our rights as United States citizens. Unfortunately, in

Saudi Arabia we have seen servicewomen who have lost their rights to wear their military-issued uniforms as they are protecting our rights. Instead, while fighting to protect our freedom and democracy, these women are being encouraged and sometimes required to wear an abaya. For those of us who are not familiar with it, it is a long black robe that covers a woman from head to toe.

Requiring women to wear this garment discriminates against them and violates their religious freedom by forcing them to adopt another faith's garb. It does not increase the safety and security of U.S. interests. Instead, it works against them. By discriminating against women in the military, we undermine the authority of officers stationed in Saudi Arabia and diminish morale among servicewomen.

Last December, Lieutenant Colonel Martha McSally, the highest ranking female fighter pilot in the Air Force, brought a lawsuit against the military for its practice of requiring servicewomen stationed in Saudi Arabia to wear this black garment, ride in the back seat of cars, and be accompanied by a man when off base. In response to her courageous suit, I sent a letter to Secretary Rumsfeld, along with 18 other Members of Congress, urging him to revoke this discriminatory policy against women serving in Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Speaker, I will include for the RECORD the referenced letter.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. The Government of Saudi Arabia does not require non-Muslim women to wear abayas and the State Department does not require them or even encourage any of its employees to wear this garment. Our Armed Forces should show the same amount of respect for its employees.

The bottom line is that our servicewomen are fulfilling a very difficult job in Saudi Arabia, and they deserve to be treated with respect. They must not be forced into a subservient position.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. servicewomen are valued, respected, capable members of our Armed Forces. It is the duty of the United States Government and its military to demonstrate to other nations how much we value our servicewomen serving overseas.

The United States must set a standard for equality around the world and stop this discriminatory treatment against American servicewomen.

I congratulate my colleagues on the committee for putting forward this bill. I support it strongly. It is an important statement in support of our women serving overseas in Saudi Arabia and other countries.

U.S. CONGRESS,

Washington, DC, Dec. 17, 2001.

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD,
Office of the Secretary, Pentagon, Washington,
DC.

DEAR SECRETARY RUMSFELD: We are very troubled to learn that American servicewomen stationed in Saudi Arabia are required to wear abayas and ride in the back

seat of cars when off base, and that they cannot go off base unless accompanied by a man. We are conscious of the need to maintain good relations with Saudi Arabia, particularly during this time of war; however, we understand that servicewomen are the only federal employees stationed in Saudi Arabia who are obliged to follow these rules.

Our servicewomen are fulfilling a very difficult job in Saudi Arabia, and they deserve to be treated with respect. By requiring servicewomen to adopt a subservient position, the military is sending the very clear signal that they are not deserving of equal respect. This has a particularly significant impact on officers, who are being asked to be subservient to men under their command. It is very difficult for these officers to maintain the same degree of authority if they must adopt a submissive role off base.

We urge you to revoke this policy and to treat servicewomen with the same dignity afforded other federal employees in Saudi Arabia.

Sincerely,

Carolyn B. Maloney; Betty McCollum; Janice Schakowsky; Lloyd Doggett; James P. McGovern; Nita Lowey; Peter DeFazio; Martin Frost; James Leach; Barbara Lee; Diane Watson; Lucille Roybal-Allard; Ellen Tauscher; Jim McDermott; Elijah Cummings; Julia Carson; George Miller; Neil Abercrombie; Diana DeGette.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the concerted efforts of several members of the Committee on Armed Services, this bill expresses the views of many Members of Congress regarding the wearing of the abaya by our military personnel serving in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Moreover, it affords the commanders the latitude necessary to educate service members about the threats and allows such force protection measures as may be dictated by a unit's mission and location. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just take a minute to thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) once again for their leadership and determination. I think that this bill sends a very clear message about how we expect our soldiers to be treated overseas and in this country.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4714, a bill to prohibit members of the Armed Forces in Saudi Arabia from being required or formally or informally compelled to wear the abaya garment. I commend my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee—Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. HOSTETTLER for their perseverance on this issue and for bringing this bill to the floor today.

This legislation will end a Defense Department policy affecting servicewomen stationed in Saudi Arabia.

It is a sad commentary that this legislation is needed at all. This policy should not have been implemented in the first place; it should have been changed rapidly when it was brought to the attention of senior commanders and the Pentagon; and the revised policy is also flawed.

This bill would have been part of the Defense Authorization bill this year, and it may be incorporated into that legislation in conference committee. It is my hope that the Defense Department won't wait to be forced to do the right thing.

Our vote tonight is to send a message to the Defense Department loud and clear: your policy requiring or strongly encouraging servicewomen stationed in Saudi Arabia to wear the abaya is without merit and is offensive to the American people. You need to change it, or the Congress will change it for you.

Mr. Speaker, those who choose to serve our country, regardless of gender, should be treated with respect by their commanders. There's a lot of talk about loyalty from the bottom up. But loyalty from the top down is more important, and more rare. Since the beginning of the Republic, Americans, both men and women have done their duty to secure the liberties that we enjoy. Women make first-class soldiers and should not be treated like second-class citizens.

But this legislation goes far beyond issues of class and respect for women in the service. The abaya is a garment that covers a Muslim woman from head to toe with only the eyes showing. It is associated by others and by servicewomen with the Muslim religion. Forcing American servicewomen—most of whom are Christian or Jewish—to wear traditional Muslim dress is deeply offensive to their religious beliefs and possibly unconstitutional.

But the Defense Department just doesn't seem to get it. They would never force American servicemen to wear a yarmulke in Israel or a crucifix in order to avoid harassment or be sensitive to the local culture. Indeed, the same regulation that ordered women to wear the abaya in Saudi Arabia prohibited servicemen from wearing local Saudi dress for men.

The Defense Department has never seemed to be troubled by this double standard that directs servicemen to dress conservatively while prohibiting the wear of local dress, and presumes that young servicewomen could not or would not follow similar command guidelines and ordered them to wear the abaya.

The Department's modified policy that "strongly encourages" women to wear the abaya only sounds satisfactory to people who have never been in the military. When an officer "strongly encourages" any young troop to do something, that is not optional. It means you darn well better do it if you value your career in the military. It means if you don't do it, you risk being branded as an attitude problem, a troublemaker, someone deserving extra (and certainly unwanted) attention that is likely to make your life a whole lot harder and possibly downright miserable. Every veteran in this body knows what I'm saying is true.

DOD's policy change to "strongly encourage" wearing the abaya was clever as a public relations move, but not clever enough to hide from this body that DOD wishes to preserve a practice offensive to military women and offensive to the American people and the beliefs we cherish.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation states that a member of the Armed Forces may not be required or formally or informally compelled to wear the abaya garment or any part of the abaya garment while in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. It prohibits taxpayer funds from being used to purchase abayas. It requires commanders to inform their troops of this policy and provide them a copy of it in writing.

The language "formally or informally compelled" is intended to cover a range of synonyms for "strongly encouraged". We did not want to prohibit DOD from "encouraging" wear of the abaya while they change their policy to "recommend" it, or "suggest" it. We are not interested in playing with words. DOD may not formally or informally compel wear of the abaya in any way. The current DOD policy of "strongly encouraging" wearing of the abaya is not consistent with this legislation and, if this legislation passes, it must be changed.

There is one exception in this legislation, and it deserves explanation. The Defense Department initially justified their abaya policy on the grounds of host nation sensitivity, even though neither the Saudi government nor the State Department require or strongly encourage wearing the abaya. In fact, the State Department also does not recommend that tourists—arguably the least prepared to deal with religious enforcers, called Mutawa'ihin—wear abayas. The recommendation for tourists is the same as for the male service members: conservative clothes that cover the arms and legs.

Then, as pressure grew, the Defense Department modified their policy and the justification for it on the grounds of "force protection". They maintain that they must continue to have the option of ordering women to wear the abaya if a commander considers it to be necessary for the safety of our servicewomen.

In passing this legislation, the Congress is explicitly rejecting this "force protection" argument. Indeed, in negotiations with DOD staff before the FY03 Defense Authorization Act came to the floor of the House, the DOD argued for a "force protection" exception that was so broad that it made the prohibition meaningless. The members of Congress involved in these discussions rejected DOD's arguments and the force protection exception is not included in this bill.

What we have included is a much narrower exception that says the commander of the United States Central Command may require the wear of the abaya in "specific circumstances" that "constitute an operational requirement essential for the conduct of the military mission."

First, the Commander of USCENTCOM may not delegate this authority to anyone else below him. Second, he may not do so based on a general need for "force protection" or "safety". The only time he may do so is if it is an operational requirement to complete the military mission.

In crafting this exception, we had in mind very unusual circumstances like special operations requiring concealment, an unusual need to move people in-country without the knowledge of the best country, or if there were widespread civil unrest to extract service members from a dangerous situation without detection or provocation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this House will be heard today and that we send a resounding message to the Department of Defense. Your policy on wearing the abaya is inconsistent with our values as a nation and we insist that it be changed.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, while I support this legislation, I would like to make a few observations. It is unfortunate that we are in a position where we must act on such legislation. Because of our unwise policy of foreign interventionism, which has placed thousands of

American service members in the Middle East including in Saudi Arabia, we are placed in a no-win situation. Either we disregard and mock the customs and culture of Saudi Arabia by refusing to adhere to dress codes that they have adopted, or we subject American women to a dress code that is offensive to our own culture and customs and is disrespectful to the sacrifices they are making for this country. What a choice, Mr. Speaker!

I am voting for this bill because I believe, on the whole, that it is preferable to place concerns about our own citizens over those whose homeland is being defended by American troops. Young Americans join the all-volunteer military as an act of patriotism in hopes of defending their country and their constitution. We in Congress must honor that sacrifice. It is bad enough that our troops are sent around the world to defend foreign soil. Asking them to comply with foreign customs which violate basic American beliefs about freedom in order to appease the very governments our troops are defending adds insult to injury. I do not believe a single female member of the armed forces enlisted for the "privilege" of wearing an abaya while defending the House of Saud or that one single male member of the armed forces enlisted in order to force his female colleagues to wear an abaya.

The fact remains that we continue to maintain troops in a place where they are not needed. It is the consequences of this dangerous policy that concern me most. Isn't it time to return to a more sound foreign policy, one that respects the culture of others by not intervening in their affairs? Is it not time to bring American troops home to protect America, rather than continuing to station them in far off lands where the protection they offer is not needed?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill to prohibit the Department of Defense from requiring female service members to wear the 'abaya', a long black robe covering the body from head to toe, worn with a head scarf and often a veil.

Currently, the DOD requires U.S. servicewomen to wear the abaya when they leave base in Saudi Arabia. DOD policy also mandates that servicewomen cannot sit in the front seat of a vehicle when traveling off-base. I am outraged that DOD would not only tolerate, but perpetrate, this type of discriminatory treatment against American servicewomen. Our women in uniform are performing their duty to protect the interests of both the United States and of the host country. It is unfortunate that the Saudi government has so little appreciation for the contributions of U.S. servicewomen as to allow harassment of them to take place at the hands of the Saudi religious police. But it is unconscionable that our own government should uphold this institutionalized disrespect of women by requiring that Americans conform to these standards.

U.S. servicewomen are valued, respected, capable members of our armed forces. It is the duty of the U.S. government, including its military, to demonstrate to other nations the high regard in which we hold them.

It is important to note that official Saudi policy does not require non-Muslim women to wear the abaya. Similarly, the U.S. State Department allows its female employees to use their own best judgment when deciding how to dress when they go outside the embassy. The Department of Defense should show the same

degree of trust in its employees, and end this backward order regarding the abaya. This legislation would do just that, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4714.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1832

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules and on approving the Journal on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3694, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4069, by the yeas and nays; and approving the Journal, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

HIGHWAY FUNDING RESTORATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3694, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3694, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 5, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie	Doggett	Jones (NC)
Aderholt	Dooley	Jones (OH)
Akin	Doolittle	Kanjorski
Allen	Doyle	Kaptur
Andrews	Dreier	Keller
Armey	Duncan	Kelly
Baca	Dunn	Kennedy (MN)
Bachus	Edwards	Kennedy (RI)
Baird	Ehlers	Kerns
Baker	Ehrlich	Kildee
Baldacci	Emerson	Kilpatrick
Baldwin	Engel	Kind (WI)
Ballenger	English	King (NY)
Barcia	Eshoo	Kingston
Barr	Etheridge	Kirk
Barrett	Evans	Kleczka
Bartlett	Everett	Knollenberg
Barton	Farr	Kolbe
Bass	Fattah	Kucinich
Becerra	Ferguson	LaFalce
Bentsen	Filner	LaHood
Bereuter	Fletcher	Lampson
Berkley	Foley	Langevin
Berman	Forbes	Lantos
Berry	Ford	Larsen (WA)
Biggert	Fossella	Larson (CT)
Bilirakis	Frank	Latham
Bishop	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Blumenauer	Frost	Leach
Blunt	Gallegly	Levin
Boehlert	Ganske	Lewis (CA)
Boehner	Gekas	Lewis (GA)
Bonilla	Gephardt	Lewis (KY)
Bonior	Gibbons	Linder
Bono	Gilchrest	Lipinski
Boozman	Gillmor	LoBiondo
Borski	Gilman	Lofgren
Boswell	Gonzalez	Lowey
Boucher	Goode	Lucas (KY)
Boyd	Goodlatte	Lucas (OK)
Brady (TX)	Gordon	Luther
Brown (FL)	Goss	Lynch
Brown (OH)	Graham	Maloney (CT)
Brown (SC)	Granger	Maloney (NY)
Bryant	Graves	Manzullo
Burr	Green (TX)	Markey
Buyer	Green (WI)	Matheson
Callahan	Greenwood	Matsui
Calvert	Grucci	McCarthy (MO)
Camp	Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)
Cantor	Gutknecht	McCollum
Capito	Hall (OH)	McCrery
Capps	Hall (TX)	McDermott
Capuano	Hansen	McGovern
Cardin	Harman	McHugh
Carson (IN)	Hart	McInnis
Carson (OK)	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Castle	Hastings (WA)	McKinney
Chabot	Hayes	McNulty
Chambliss	Hayworth	Meehan
Clay	Hefley	Meek (FL)
Clayton	Herger	Meeks (NY)
Clement	Hill	Menendez
Clyburn	Hilleary	Mica
Coble	Hilliard	Millender-
Collins	Hinchev	McDonald
Combest	Hinojosa	Miller, Dan
Condit	Hobson	Miller, Gary
Conyers	Hoeffel	Miller, George
Cooksey	Hoekstra	Miller, Jeff
Costello	Holden	Mink
Cox	Holt	Mollohan
Coyne	Honda	Moore
Cramer	Hooley	Moran (KS)
Crane	Horn	Moran (VA)
Crenshaw	Hostettler	Morella
Crowley	Houghton	Merrick
Cubin	Hoyer	Nadler
Culberson	Hulshof	Napolitano
Cummings	Hunter	Neal
Cunningham	Hyde	Nethercutt
Davis (CA)	Inslee	Ney
Davis (FL)	Isakson	Northup
Davis (IL)	Israel	Norwood
Davis, Jo Ann	Issa	Nussle
Davis, Tom	Istook	Oberstar
Deal	Jackson (IL)	Obey
DeFazio	Jackson-Lee	Olver
DeGette	(TX)	Ortiz
Delahunt	Jefferson	Osborne
DeLauro	Jenkins	Ose
DeLay	John	Otter
DeMint	Johnson (CT)	Owens
Deutsch	Johnson (IL)	Oxley
Dicks	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Dingell	Johnson, Sam	Pascarell

Pastor	Saxton	Thompson (MS)
Pelosi	Schakowsky	Thornberry
Pence	Schiff	Thune
Peterson (PA)	Schrock	Thurman
Petri	Scott	Tiahrt
Phelps	Sensenbrenner	Tiberi
Pickering	Serrano	Tierney
Pitts	Shaw	Toomey
Platts	Shays	Towns
Pombo	Sherman	Turner
Pomeroy	Sherwood	Udall (CO)
Portman	Shinkus	Udall (NM)
Price (NC)	Shows	Udall (NM)
Pryce (OH)	Shuster	Velazquez
Putnam	Simmons	Vitter
Quinn	Simpson	Visclosky
Radanovich	Skeen	Vitter
Rahall	Skelton	Walden
Eramstad	Slaughter	Walsh
Rangel	Smith (MI)	Wamp
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Rehberg	Smith (TX)	Watkins (OK)
Reyes	Smith (WA)	Watson (CA)
Reynolds	Snyder	Watt (NC)
Rivers	Solis	Watts (OK)
Rodriguez	Souder	Waxman
Roemer	Spratt	Weiner
Rogers (KY)	Stark	Weldon (FL)
Rogers (MI)	Stearns	Weldon (PA)
Rohrabacher	Stenholm	Weller
Ros-Lehtinen	Strickland	Wexler
Ross	Stupak	Whitfield
Roukema	Sullivan	Wicker
Roybal-Allard	Sununu	Wilson (NM)
Rush	Tancredo	Wilson (SC)
Ryan (WI)	Tanner	Wolf
Ryun (KS)	Tauscher	Woolsey
Sabo	Tauzin	Wu
Sanchez	Taylor (MS)	Wynn
Sanders	Taylor (NC)	Young (AK)
Sandlin	Thomas	Young (FL)
Sawyer	Thompson (CA)	

NAYS—5

Flake	Royce	Shadegg
Paul	Sessions	

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman	Mascara	Schaffer
Blagojevich	McIntyre	Stump
Brady (PA)	Murtha	Sweeney
Burton	Payne	Terry
Cannon	Peterson (MN)	Traficant
Diaz-Balart	Riley	
Lee	Rothman	

□ 1854

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 159 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT ENHANCEMENTS FOR WOMEN ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4069, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4069, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	DeFazio	Hoyer
Aderholt	DeGette	Hulshof
Akin	Delahunt	Hunter
Allen	DeLauro	Hyde
Andrews	DeLay	Inslee
Armey	DeMint	Isakson
Baca	Deutsch	Israel
Bachus	Dicks	Issa
Baird	Dingell	Istook
Baker	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Baldacci	Dooley	Jackson-Lee
Baldwin	Doolittle	(TX)
Ballenger	Doyle	Jefferson
Barcia	Dreier	Jenkins
Barr	Duncan	John
Barrett	Dunn	Johnson (CT)
Bartlett	Edwards	Johnson (IL)
Barton	Ehlers	Johnson, E. B.
Bass	Ehrlich	Johnson, Sam
Becerra	Emerson	Jones (NC)
Bentsen	Engel	Jones (OH)
Bereuter	English	Kanjorski
Berkley	Eshoo	Kaptur
Berman	Etheridge	Keller
Berry	Evans	Kelly
Biggert	Everett	Kennedy (MN)
Bilirakis	Farr	Kennedy (RI)
Bishop	Fattah	Kerns
Blumenauer	Ferguson	Kildee
Blunt	Filner	Kilpatrick
Boehlert	Flake	Kind (WI)
Boehner	Fletcher	King (NY)
Bonilla	Foley	Kingston
Bonior	Forbes	Kirk
Bono	Ford	Kleczka
Boozman	Fossella	Knollenberg
Borski	Frank	Kolbe
Boswell	Frelinghuysen	Kucinich
Boucher	Frost	LaFalce
Boyd	Gallegly	LaHood
Brady (TX)	Ganske	Lampson
Brown (FL)	Gekas	Langevin
Brown (OH)	Gephardt	Lantos
Brown (SC)	Gibbons	Larsen (WA)
Bryant	Gilchrest	Larson (CT)
Burr	Gillmor	Latham
Buyer	Gilman	LaTourette
Callahan	Gonzalez	Leach
Calvert	Goode	Lee
Camp	Goodlatte	Levin
Cantor	Gordon	Lewis (CA)
Capito	Goss	Lewis (GA)
Capps	Graham	Lewis (KY)
Capuano	Granger	Linder
Cardin	Graves	Lipinski
Carson (IN)	Green (TX)	LoBiondo
Carson (OK)	Green (WI)	Lofgren
Castle	Greenwood	Lowe
Chabot	Grucci	Lucas (KY)
Chambliss	Gutierrez	Lucas (OK)
Clay	Gutknecht	Luther
Clayton	Hall (OH)	Lynch
Clement	Hall (TX)	Maloney (CT)
Clyburn	Hansen	Maloney (NY)
Coble	Harman	Manzullo
Collins	Hart	Markey
Combest	Hastings (FL)	Matheson
Condit	Hastings (WA)	Mathsui
Conyers	Hayes	McCarthy (MO)
Cooksey	Hayworth	McCarthy (NY)
Costello	Hefley	McCollum
Cox	Herger	McCrery
Coyne	Hill	McDermott
Cramer	Hilleary	McGovern
Crane	Hilliard	McHugh
Crenshaw	Hinchee	McInnis
Crowley	Hinojosa	McKeon
Cubin	Hobson	McKinney
Culberson	Hoeffel	McNulty
Cummings	Hoekstra	Meehan
Cunningham	Holden	Meek (FL)
Davis (CA)	Holt	Meeks (NY)
Davis (FL)	Honda	Menendez
Davis (IL)	Hooley	Mica
Davis, Jo Ann	Horn	Millender-
Davis, Tom	Hostettler	McDonald
Deal	Houghton	Miller, Dan

Miller, Gary	Reyes	Strickland
Miller, George	Reynolds	Stump
Miller, Jeff	Rivers	Stupak
Mink	Rodriguez	Sullivan
Mollohan	Roemer	Sununu
Moore	Rogers (KY)	Tancredo
Moran (KS)	Rogers (MI)	Tanner
Moran (VA)	Rohrabacher	Tauscher
Morella	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauzin
Myrick	Ross	Taylor (MS)
Nadler	Roukema	Taylor (NC)
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard	Thomas
Neal	Royce	Thompson (CA)
Nethercutt	Rush	Thompson (MS)
Ney	Ryan (WI)	Thornberry
Northup	Ryun (KS)	Thune
Norwood	Sabo	Thurman
Nussle	Sanchez	Tiahrt
Obey	Sanders	Tiberi
Oliver	Sandlin	Tierney
Ortiz	Sawyer	Toomey
Osborne	Saxton	Towns
Ose	Schakowsky	Turner
Otter	Schiff	Udall (CO)
Owens	Schrock	Udall (NM)
Oxley	Scott	Upton
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Velazquez
Pascarell	Serrano	Visclosky
Pastor	Sessions	Vitter
Paul	Shadegge	Walden
Pelosi	Shaw	Walsh
Pence	Shays	Wamp
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Waters
Peterson (PA)	Sherwood	Watkins (OK)
Petri	Shimkus	Watson (CA)
Phelps	Shows	Watt (NC)
Pickering	Shuster	Watts (OK)
Pitts	Simmons	Waxman
Platts	Simpson	Weiner
Pombo	Skeen	Weldon (FL)
Pomeroy	Skelton	Weldon (PA)
Portman	Slaughter	Weller
Price (NC)	Smith (MI)	Wexler
Pryce (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield
Putnam	Smith (TX)	Wicker
Quinn	Smith (WA)	Wilson (NM)
Radanovich	Snyder	Wilson (SC)
Rahall	Solis	Wolf
Ramstad	Souder	Woolsey
Rangel	Spratt	Wu
Regula	Stark	Wynn
Rehberg	Stearns	Young (AK)
	Stenholm	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman	Mascara	Schaffer
Blagojevich	McIntyre	Sweeney
Brady (PA)	Murtha	Terry
Burton	Payne	Trafficant
Cannon	Riley	
Diaz-Balart	Rothman	

□ 1905

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "To amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for miscellaneous enhancements in Social Security benefits, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 160 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3321

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 3321.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 371, noes 40, answered "present" 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—371

Abercrombie	Davis (CA)	Herger
Akin	Davis (FL)	Hill
Allen	Davis (IL)	Hilleary
Andrews	Davis, Jo Ann	Hinchee
Armey	Davis, Tom	Hinojosa
Baca	Deal	Hobson
Bachus	DeGette	Hoeffel
Baker	Delahunt	Hoekstra
Baldacci	DeLauro	Holden
Ballenger	DeLay	Holt
Barcia	DeMint	Honda
Barr	Deutsch	Hooley
Barrett	Diaz-Balart	Horn
Bartlett	Dingell	Hostettler
Barton	Doggett	Houghton
Bass	Dooley	Hoyer
Becerra	Doolittle	Hulshof
Bentsen	Doyle	Hunter
Bereuter	Dreier	Hyde
Berkley	Duncan	Inslee
Berman	Dunn	Isakson
Berry	Edwards	Israel
Biggert	Ehlers	Issa
Bilirakis	Ehrlich	Istook
Bishop	Emerson	Jackson (IL)
Blumenauer	Engel	Jackson-Lee
Blunt	Eshoo	(TX)
Boehlert	Etheridge	Jefferson
Boehner	Evans	Jenkins
Bonilla	Everett	John
Bonior	Farr	Johnson (CT)
Bono	Ferguson	Johnson (IL)
Boozman	Flake	Johnson, E. B.
Boswell	Fletcher	Johnson, Sam
Boucher	Foley	Jones (NC)
Boyd	Forbes	Jones (OH)
Brady (TX)	Ford	Kanjorski
Brown (FL)	Fossella	Kaptur
Brown (SC)	Frank	Keller
Bryant	Frelinghuysen	Kelly
Burr	Frost	Kennedy (MN)
Buyer	Gallegly	Kennedy (RI)
Callahan	Ganske	Kerns
Calvert	Gekas	Kildee
Camp	Gephardt	Kilpatrick
Cantor	Gibbons	Kind (WI)
Capito	Gilchrest	King (NY)
Capps	Gilman	Kingston
Cardin	Gonzalez	Kirk
Carson (IN)	Goode	Kleczka
Carson (OK)	Goodlatte	Knollenberg
Castle	Gordon	Kolbe
Chabot	Goss	LaFalce
Chambliss	Graham	LaHood
Clay	Granger	Langevin
Clayton	Graves	Lantos
Clement	Green (TX)	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Green (WI)	Latham
Coble	Greenwood	LaTourette
Collins	Grucci	Leach
Combest	Gutierrez	Lee
Conyers	Gutknecht	Levin
Cooksey	Hall (OH)	Lewis (CA)
Cox	Hall (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Coyne	Hansen	Lewis (KY)
Cramer	Harman	Linder
Crenshaw	Hart	Lipinski
Crowley	Hastings (FL)	Lofgren
Cubin	Hastings (WA)	Lowe
Culberson	Hayes	Lucas (KY)
Cummings	Hayworth	Lucas (OK)

Luther	Pickering	Skelton
Lynch	Pitts	Slaughter
Maloney (CT)	Platts	Smith (NJ)
Maloney (NY)	Pombo	Smith (TX)
Manzullo	Pomeroy	Smith (WA)
Matsui	Portman	Snyder
McCarthy (MO)	Price (NC)	Solis
McCarthy (NY)	Pryce (OH)	Spratt
McCollum	Putnam	Stark
McCrery	Quinn	Stearns
McGovern	Radanovich	Stump
McHugh	Rahall	Sullivan
McInnis	Rangel	Sununu
McKeon	Regula	Tanner
McKinney	Reyes	Tauscher
McNulty	Reynolds	Tauzin
Meehan	Rivers	Taylor (NC)
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Thomas
Meeks (NY)	Roemer	Thompson (MS)
Menendez	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Millender-	Rogers (MI)	Thune
McDonald	Rohrabacher	Thurman
Miller, Dan	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiahrt
Miller, Gary	Ross	Tiberi
Miller, Jeff	Rothman	Tierney
Mink	Roukema	Toomey
Mollohan	Roybal-Allard	Turner
Moran (VA)	Royce	Udall (CO)
Morella	Rush	Upton
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Velazquez
Nadler	Ryun (KS)	Vitter
Napolitano	Sanchez	Walden
Neal	Sanders	Walsh
Nethercutt	Sandlin	Wamp
Ney	Sawyer	Waters
Northup	Saxton	Watkins (OK)
Norwood	Schakowsky	Watson (CA)
Nussle	Schiff	Watt (NC)
Obey	Schrock	Watts (OK)
Ortiz	Scott	Waxman
Osborne	Sensenbrenner	Weiner
Ose	Serrano	Weldon (FL)
Otter	Sessions	Weldon (PA)
Owens	Shadegg	Wexler
Oxley	Shaw	Whitfield
Pallone	Shays	Wilson (NM)
Pascrell	Sherman	Wilson (SC)
Pastor	Sherwood	Wolf
Paul	Shimkus	Woolsey
Pelosi	Shows	Wynn
Pence	Shuster	Young (AK)
Peterson (PA)	Simmons	Young (FL)
Petri	Simpson	
Phelps	Skeen	

NOES—40

Aderholt	Hefley	Ramstad
Baird	Hilliard	Sabo
Baldwin	Kucinich	Stenholm
Borski	Larsen (WA)	Strickland
Brown (OH)	LoBiondo	Stupak
Capuano	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Condit	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Costello	McDermott	Udall (NM)
Crane	Miller, George	Visclosky
DeFazio	Moore	Weller
English	Moran (KS)	Wicker
Fattah	Oberstar	Wu
Filner	Olver	
Gillmor	Peterson (MN)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman	Mascara	Smith (MI)
Blagojevich	McIntyre	Souder
Brady (PA)	Mica	Sweeney
Burton	Murtha	Terry
Cannon	Payne	Towns
Cunningham	Rehberg	Traficant
Dicks	Riley	
Lampson	Schaffer	

□ 1915

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House,

the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SPORTS AGENT RESPONSIBILITY AND TRUST ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, recently the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and I joined to introduce the Sports Agent Responsibility and Trust Act.

Each year, hundreds of college athletes are offered illegal inducements to enter into contracts prior to the exhaustion of the athletes' eligibility by unscrupulous sports agents. Often these actions result in three major problems.

Number one, the loss of the athletes' eligibility. Personally, I experienced having a player back in the 1980s who was offered some illegal inducements, lost his eligibility, and pretty much ruined his career. That same player was involved with some agents who really had given illegal inducements to several players around the country. They were eventually indicted on a number of felonies. They threatened some of the players with bodily harm. However, in the State of Nebraska, we lacked the laws to pursue these agents.

Secondly, there is a financial loss to the athlete and the school when illegal agent offers are involved. Again, a personal note, I had a player back in the 1980s who thought he signed a contract for giving 3 percent of his proceeds to the agent, but somewhere buried in the contract was 13 percent. So he lost hundreds of thousands of dollars. Fortunately, that player was able to recover more than \$300,000 because the agent with which he had signed the illegal contract had previously come from the State of California, where there are laws that govern agents, and since that agent had not registered under California law, we were able to recover \$300,000. However, in the State of Nebraska we could not do this because Nebraska, again, had no law that would enable us to prosecute.

Recently, an agent named Tank Black was sentenced to 5 years in prison for swindling athletes for more than \$12 million, and so we think this is important. It also allows the schools to file civil lawsuits against unethical agents.

Thirdly, another issue that is very important, a negative perception of intercollegiate athletics often results when athletes enter into illegal contracts with agents. So the recent pre-

vious cases would involve the University of Alabama, University of Louisville, University of California, University of Utah, Texas Southern, University of Miami at Florida, University of Southern California, Tennessee, Ohio State, Texas A&M, Florida State and others, and in each one of these cases the school really did nothing illegal. It simply had some players that entered into illegal negotiations with agents, and of course, this reflected negatively on the school.

Currently 17 States in our country, including my home State of Nebraska, have no regulations governing sports agents. The legislation that we are proposing provides a uniform Federal backstop that applies to all States. This bill does not supersede State law. It simply aids and abets those States that do have regulations governing sports agents.

This act brings sports agents under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, which provides for a fine of \$11,000 per day per event. State laws cannot cross State borders. So until all 50 States adopt uniform standards there is not uniformity in the law regulating sports agents.

The Sports Agent Responsibility Act provides a separate Federal remedy for States Attorneys General to prosecute sports agents who attempt to exploit student athletes across State lines.

I urge my colleagues to join the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and me as we try to protect intercollegiate athletics from unscrupulous sports agents.

CUBA'S DEVELOPMENT OF BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to a recent statement by the Bush administration confirming Cuba's development of a biological warfare program and the possible transfer of this knowledge to other rogue nations.

Mr. Speaker, Cuba is designated by the State Department as one of seven nations who sponsor international terrorism. However, since the collapse of the Soviet Union many Americans make the mistake of believing that Cuba is no longer a threat to our national security.

Recent votes here in the House have reflected this shift in public perception. Just 3 weeks ago we voted on a motion to instruct conferees on the farm bill to include a provision that would lift part of the trade embargo that would allow for public financing of agricultural trade with Cuba. I opposed this motion because I feel that it is shortsighted to lift economic sanctions when the Cuban government has done little to prove their worthiness of an economic partnership with the United States.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Fidel Castro shows only his open hostility to the United States by pursuing biological warfare research. He has what are considered to be the most sophisticated biomedical capabilities in Latin America. Cuba stands as one of the few developing nations who plays a significant role in drug and biotechnology activities.

Mr. Speaker, there is evidence that Cuba is experimenting with anthrax, as well as a number of other deadly pathogens. Some experts believe that Cuba is even capable of making genetically modified germ weapons that are able to defeat vaccines and antibiotics.

Unfortunately, the possibility that a rogue nation only 90 miles from our shores is producing biological weapons is not the worst of our problems. Mr. Speaker, intelligence officials have evidence that Cuba may be selling its bioterrorist knowledge to other nations hostile to the United States.

Last year, Castro visited Iran, Syria and Libya, three nations that occupy spots on the State Department's terrorism list, along with Cuba and three nations that are currently attempting to develop weapons of mass destruction. During his visit to Tehran University, Castro stated that together Iran and Cuba could "bring America to its knees." An unnerving thought when we consider that Cuba is closer to the United States mainland than Washington, D.C., is to my home in New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we put the debate about Cuba and the Castro regime into the proper perspective for the American people. Too often people are only willing to see the economic benefit of trade with Cuba and lifting the trade embargoes. They do not understand that by lifting the embargo, without agreements by Castro to stop biological weapons production and without commitments on human rights or civil liberties, that we are giving Castro exactly what he wants.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we see Castro and his regime for what they really are, a continued threat to the security of the United States.

RURAL TANF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this body will take up the reauthorization of the 1996 welfare law. Much has been said about this bill and no doubt debate will go on for some time. However, remarkably little has been said about one aspect of it, the rural aspect.

It will not be surprising to Members of this body that there is a difference between urban and rural areas. In fact, let me just tell my colleagues, 237 out of the 250 poorest counties in the United States in 1998 were nonmetropolitan, and that persists today.

One-half of rural American children and female heads of household live in poverty. Rural workers are nearly twice as likely to earn the minimum wage and 40 percent less likely to move out of low wage, entry level positions. Six out of 10 rural people in poverty do not own a car. The rural urban earning gap persists and actually has widened through the latter part of the 1990s. There is a gap of 73 to 70 percent.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at making work an essential part of the welfare effort, and I believe that work should be, in fact I think work is very honorable and we should encourage everyone to find the satisfaction as well as the responsibility of doing something that is valuable to themselves but also will have income, but the reality is this: Labor markets in rural areas are often very limited. There is a high unemployment rate in rural areas because the opportunities are not there.

So if we are indeed encouraging that more people should work, we need to then speak to putting in the infrastructure for training, jobs, day care and transportation, particularly those areas in the Mississippi Delta, the Appalachia and the Lower Rio Grande Valley and in Indian Country. It is in 240 of those 250 counties I talked about. So there are 240 counties in this country, the poorest counties, indeed will have difficulty finding jobs, maintaining the same work they had 3 years ago. Their unemployment indeed has gone up and the job opportunities have gone down.

The third exemption from time limits for counties with high rates of unemployment failed, let me say that again, failed to address the problem adequately in more rural areas. Official unemployment statistics underestimate the true rate of unemployment. There are many discouraged workers with few opportunities that do not even bother to go to the unemployment office or go seeking assistance because they know there are so little job opportunities. They know jobs do not exist, and therefore they do not even bother.

So if we use the known statistical data, that in itself is false, but also what we do know is that there is a lack of opportunity, and if indeed we wanted to find how States were responding to that, I have just submitted an amendment to the Rules Committee they ought to have to require each State governor to say to the Secretary in their plan how they propose to ensure there are job opportunities or if there are work opportunities, training opportunities, are there day care opportunities, transportation. All of that means new resources. So if we are not making any differential in adding new resources to rural areas, we are putting the governors in the States throughout the United States, putting them in a decisive difficult fiscal position, and we should ask them how they propose to meet that obligation that they are given.

So, in fact, in some rural areas the true unemployment is double. For ex-

ample, the official unemployment rate of Indian reservations often are 20 and 30 percent. However, according to the Department of Labor, it is sometimes higher than that, and yet we are requiring that individuals in those communities will have the same rate for the very poor.

Therefore, provisions of the legislation that are based on the official statistical data of unemployment is a false premise in order to give the governors the response to make a way. We need to find other ways of speaking to that.

So there needs to be a recognition, Mr. Speaker, that child care that is so essential for mothers to leave their children and go to work, that is not available in rural areas. Unless we are willing to provide for education and training, transportation, day care, the rural community will not be able to respond to the citizens who need that help, and the current proposal that is before this House has nothing in there. In fact, I will be asking for unanimous consent that we add that provision to the bill on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RAISING THE DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, tonight we want to come again before the body and talk about raising the debt limit.

□ 1930

It is fascinating, having been around this place for now almost 23 years, to hear and to see how various Members of this body react to certain situations that come up, depending on whether they are in the minority or in the majority. And there is no question that we have a serious problem facing our Nation coming up beginning this week, and then about June 28 it becomes of crisis proportion. Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill has formally requested Congress to increase the statutory limit on the publicly held debt by \$750 billion, and that is billion with a "b," up from the current level of \$5.95 trillion to \$6.7 trillion.

Just today, Secretary O'Neill wrote the Congress again telling us that he will use up our borrowing authority by the end of this week and that we will have to begin juggling with the books in order to avoid a default, and by the end of June, at the latest, he will run out of maneuvers.

Last week, the Congressional Budget Office issued a report indicating that revenues are coming in much lower than expected and the deficit will be much higher than they projected earlier this year. It is likely we will borrow the entire Social Security trust fund and then some and still have a deficit of over \$150 billion this year.

The need for an increase in the debt limit of the magnitude requested by the administration cannot be explained by the economy and cost of the war. The administration projects that under the President's budget policies the national debt will be roughly \$2.75 trillion more debt than was projected at the beginning of last year, before the President's budget policies and this body enacted them. The cost of the war and the downturn in the economy explain roughly \$800 billion of that increase in projected debt, which leaves nearly \$1.9 trillion more debt than was projected a year ago that is not explained by spending on the war on terrorism or the economic downturn.

In fact, the administration acknowledged prior to September 11 that the debt limit would need to be raised much earlier than it projected when the President submitted his initial budget proposal in January. Last August, the administration indicated that it expected that the debt limit would have to be increased in 2003, 5 years earlier than they projected when the budget was submitted. Well, a year ago, the administration indicated that we would not need to raise the debt limit for 7 years and actually claimed that there was a danger that the government would actually pay off the debt held by the public too quickly.

The Blue Dogs warned about the danger of making long-term commitments for tax cuts or new spending programs based on projected surpluses and proposed setting aside half of the on-budget surplus for a cushion to protect against unforeseen changes. In fact, we supported a budget here about a year ago that would have been much more conservative than the budget that passed and was signed into law; but we, being in the minority, lost.

It is interesting when one listens to the leadership of this body, and here let me give a little quote. When President Clinton asked for a new bill to increase the debt limit, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), now the majority leader of this body, said: "He will get it, but with conditions." That was January 23, 1996. The same majority leader of this body, responding on April 9, called the debate over raising the debt limit "an academic question" and described the whole idea of a debt ceiling as "political." He said, "My

recommendation is to take the President's number and move it. Whatever number that is, I don't care." On January 23, 1996, the majority leader said, "House Republicans insist that any increase in the debt limit must be tied to substantial concessions by the White House in talks over balancing the Federal budget." On April 10, 2002, the same majority leader of this body said, "Congress and the House of Representatives should quickly approve President Bush's request for a \$750 billion increase in the on's borrowing authority."

Now, I agreed with Majority Leader Arme 6 years ago when there was a Democrat in the White House that was not putting forward a plan that would bring us into balance as quickly as we needed to. I agreed with the majority leader then, but I disagree with him tonight; and I disagree with the leadership of this body in refusing to put forward a plan to get us back on a balanced budget for our country.

That is what the Blue Dogs wrote the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), last Friday. The leadership of our Blue Dogs sent a letter to Speaker HASTERT in which we offered in good faith to work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to put together a blueprint, a new budget, if you please, that would get us back on a path of balancing our budget and getting out of the Social Security trust funds.

Now, I do not know why the leadership of this House has suddenly taken such a turn that we have seen taken over the last several years in which very seldom are ideas from this side of the aisle ever taken into serious consideration. Just last Thursday, we had the defense authorization bill on this floor, supported tremendously in a bipartisan way, as they always are. But we had a situation there that I do not recall seeing in previous years, in which Members on this side of the aisle had amendments but were denied the opportunity to have their amendment taken up and voted on on the floor of the House.

My colleague who will join me in just a moment, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), had a couple of not unreasonable amendments. He felt very strongly that this body, the Congress, and the House of Representatives in particular, should have had an opportunity to debate whether or not we are going to have a new base closing commission. Not an unreasonable request. We had amendments that were allowed that had 10 minutes, 20 minutes; but the gentleman from Mississippi was denied. He exercised his right to express himself, and I hope the leadership of this body listened to what the gentleman was saying last Thursday.

What the gentleman was saying is, this body, the House of Representatives, has been the envy of most of the rest of the world since our very creation, in which individuals have the

right and the opportunity to bring up their ideas and have them discussed on the floor of the House and voted upon. What is so unusual about that and what is it that seems now that in most cases we do not have the kind of committee hearings, we do not have a rule that allows various Members to express themselves on this floor?

Well, tonight, we take this hour to talk about our willingness on this side of the aisle to work with our colleagues, if there are any on the other side that are interested, in restoring fiscal sovereignty, fiscal strength to the budget of the United States of America. We say this and we are prepared to offer some suggestions. In fact, it is interesting, there are very few of these suggestions that are new. They have all been tried. It matters not which side of the aisle. So this is what we want to talk about tonight.

We would like to see, before we vote to increase how much money our country can borrow, we would like to see a new plan, because the current plan is now telling us that we will have deficits as far as the eye can see. And as one Member who has spent a good part of the last 6 years trying to work in a bipartisan way, in a bicameral way on Social Security reform, it pains me quite a bit to see that we cannot even bring that subject up and talk about it. I hope that changes also.

Tonight we just want to again renew our offer, our plea to the majority of this body that before we increase our debt ceiling, let us take another look at the budget plan that we are operating under. If my colleagues on the other side want votes on our side, we have already said we will give those votes to increase the debt ceiling, but not \$750 billion with a blank check.

We are perfectly willing to give an increase in the debt ceiling that will get us to September 30 of this year. Let us wait and see how the CBO reestimates the spending and the revenue that are going to be coming in; and then let us take that new estimate and when we come back in September, let us pass a new budget, one of the better things we could do for the economy of this country.

And in so doing, then we would be prepared to offer another short-term debt ceiling increase to get us to next April or May. Again, let the new Congress come back, the new Congress that will be elected in November, and let us see what our economy is doing come January and a new round of budget discussions and budget debates. It seems to us that that makes sense. But it seems to the other side of the aisle that, no, we passed a budget last year, and we are going to stay with it no matter what.

The budget that was passed last year assumed 100 percent of the projected surplus and left no margin for error. We put ourselves on a course to run up our debt. Now that circumstances have changed, the projected surpluses have disappeared. And while we agree that

the unforeseen war on terrorism and economic downturn have had an impact on the budget in the short term, we do not believe that these events should be used to justify a return to chronic, long-term deficits or hide a \$750 billion increase in the debt ceiling.

The leadership of this body has indicated that they plan to slip language into the supplemental appropriation bill that will allow them to hide an increase in the debt limit in an omnibus conference report without any debate or vote. We do not believe that we should use a spending bill to fight the war on terrorism to hide or justify a long-term \$750 billion increase in the debt ceiling absent a plan to improve our long-term fiscal position.

Members on the other side were very willing to stand up and take credit when we were passing legislation that put us into the situation we face today and made an increase in the debt limit necessary. They should be willing to stand up and be counted now that it has come time to pay the bills by raising the debt limit.

We need a plan. Before Congress votes to raise the debt ceiling by \$750 billion, the President must work with Congress to put the fiscal house back in order, just as a family facing financial problems must work with a bank to establish a financial plan in order to get approval to refinance their debts. We will not vote to approve an increase in the debt limit to allow the government to continue on the current course of deficits as far as the eye can see.

Let me quote another leader of our House, my fellow colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), when he said, "We said from the beginning of this Congress that we want to negotiate with the President. But we cannot negotiate with a President that does not want to balance the budget. We do not want to negotiate over whether to balance the budget or not, we want him to submit a budget that balances by CBO, which he called for. We will negotiate with him in the parameters of a balanced budget and negotiate over the priorities within that balanced budget. But if the President cannot submit one, how do we negotiate apples with oranges? You know, the saying goes, if at first you do not succeed try, try again."

Here again, this is one Member that agreed with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) back when he was talking to a different President. We agree tonight. And I do not believe that we should have a confrontation with this White House over this matter. I think the confrontation is right here within the House of Representatives. And that is what the Blue Dogs are offering again, the willingness to work with our friends on the other side of the aisle to come up with a new budget plan that does get us back into balance.

□ 1945

Mr. Speaker, with those opening remarks I turn to the gentleman from

Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) and yield to him to continue this discussion.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) will note that in the 6 years that our Republican colleagues have controlled the House, despite the talk of desiring a balanced budget, they have scheduled but one vote on a balanced budget amendment. I regret to say they are not as serious about a balanced budget as they promised the American people. But then again, they make a lot of promises that they do not keep.

I remember this one in particular. I remember flying up from my district in 1995 around Christmas when there was a government shutdown going on. The children of folks who had a mom or dad in a veterans' hospital were concerned. People in the shipping business wanted to know if the channels were going to get dredged. Americans were worried about illegal immigration and if the staff of a veterans' hospital were going to show up. There were a lot of concerns about shutting down the government.

One of the ways that the Republican leadership tried to mislead the American public that everything was fine, they ran this ad. This is Haley Barbour, the former head of the Republican National Party, a fellow Mississippian. It starts off, heard the one about the Republicans cutting Medicare, and he is holding a check for a million dollars, your name here.

It says, the fact is the Republicans are increasing Medicare spending by more than half. I am Haley Barbour, and I am so sure of that fact that I am willing to give you this check for a million bucks if you can prove me wrong. Sounds simple, right?

So here is the challenge. Here is why you have no chance for the million dollars, and it is a form to be filled out. It says, "The Republican National Committee will present a cashier's check for \$1 million to the first American who can prove the following statement is false: In November, 1995, U.S. House and Senate passed a balanced budget bill. It increases total Federal spending on Medicare by more than 50 percent from 1995 to 2002 pursuant to the Congressional Budget Office standards." Responses must be postmarked by December 20, 1995.

I guess I am one budget wonk, I do follow these things, and I knew from the minute that he printed that ad, that it was a lie. You see, the budget that passed in 1995 was projected to be \$200 billion in deficits; and let us remember, we are not talking a small amount of money. A lot of Americans pay \$1,000 a month on their house or rent note. If you made that payment 1,000 times, you have spent a million dollars. If you made that payment a thousand more times, you have then spent a billion dollars. The budget that he is calling balanced was \$200 billion in deficit.

So I called the Congressional Budget Office, and I got a copy of their budget

projections; and I went over to the Republican National Committee and left a letter for Mr. Barbour saying you have misled the American people. As a matter of fact, it is false, and I would like the million dollars. And since I used my office to do this research, I do not think it would be fair for me to keep the money, so I am going to give it to the University of Southern Mississippi to train people to be better mathematicians than you are. That was in December of 1995.

At the time Mr. Barbour said this, our Nation was \$4.973 trillion in debt, but he promised the American people to have passed a balanced budget bill. At the end of that year, their budget added \$250 billion to the deficit. A year later, \$190 billion more. A year later, \$113 billion more. A year later, \$146 billion more; all of the way up to year 2000, another \$20 billion.

What particularly irks me is after answering Mr. Barbour's challenge, and about 80 other folks around the country did so, the Republican National Committee, instead of saying gee, we misled you or maybe admitting they made a mistake, they sued us. I had to hire a lawyer to defend myself for filling out their form. The case is still now in court, interestingly enough. But Mr. Barbour, not only did you not balance the budget, but since the passage of that bill, we have added over \$1 trillion to the national debt.

See, like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), I was appalled when a year ago a lot of my colleagues, the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, the majority whip were running around saying Washington is awash in money, huge surpluses as far as the eye can see. We do not know what to do with the money; therefore, we have to pass these tax cuts.

When the President said that a year ago right now, our Nation was \$5,661,347,798,002.65 in debt. Since the passage of the tax cuts, the debt has increased by \$323 billion. For those following this debate, I am going to do something a little different than what the Speaker or the majority leader and the President of the United States did. I am going to ask Americans to check my numbers. They are available to every American at www.publicdebt.treas.gov/, and see for yourself just how broke America is.

What is particularly galling, for those with teenagers who have a job, and who look on their pay stub and say, What is this FICA?, that is your Social Security taxes; and they are taken with the solemn promise that they are to be spent on nothing but Social Security.

If we could find the mythical lockbox that a lot of presidential candidates talked about, and opened it up, all that would be there is an IOU for \$1.260 trillion.

Further down on the pay stub we see money is deducted for the Federal health insurance program, Medicare. In that lockbox all we would find is \$263

billion is owed. The money has been spent on other things.

If you work for the Department of Defense and wanted to find their so-called lockbox, \$167 billion is owed to it. The Civil Service Retirement Fund, a lot of people work for our Nation, border agents, people in the Customs Department, Coast Guard, \$527 billion is owed to their trust fund right now.

Mr. Speaker, you have been the Speaker for almost 4 years. You come from the party that claims to be for fiscal responsibility. Yet in the 4 years you have been Speaker, you have not scheduled one vote on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Almost every city has that.

When I was a city councilman down in Bay St. Louis, Mississippi, I remember the city attorney telling me next month we are going to put together the budget and it has to balance. If it does not balance, you and other council members are personally liable for the difference between what is collected in taxes and what is spent. I can assure Members, we balanced the budget.

A couple of years later I was elected to the State senate. Mississippi has a balanced budget amendment to its constitution. Again we were informed that if we spent more money than we collected in taxes, that we could be thrown out of office. Those are good rules. They are very good rules because it prevents this kind of nonsense from happening.

What is particularly distressing about this \$5.984 trillion debt that the President wants to raise by another \$750 billion, if the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) were on this floor on January 1, 1980, that number would have been less than \$1 trillion. What is particularly disturbing is that the children of the greatest generation, if they do not change the way they are doing things, could be remembered as the worst generation. I do believe that my parents' generation was the best. They survived the Great Depression, got us through World War II, Korea, Vietnam, built the highway systems, the Intercoastal Waterway; and they did it all for less than \$1 trillion in debt. As a matter of fact, if we went all of the way from the time George Washington became President until Ronald Reagan became President, our Nation was less than \$1 trillion in debt. Now 20-something years later, we are almost \$6 trillion in debt, and yet we cannot have a vote on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I know you are a busy man, and I know the time on this floor is very busy. But you know what, today you scheduled a vote on the Nutria Eradication Act, and it is important to protect the marshland on the Chesapeake, it is important to those folks, and I know that they are doing a lot of damage to the marsh; but you scheduled 40 minutes of debate on the Nutria Eradication Act, and yet we cannot have a vote on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

You scheduled another vote on concessions maintenance and wildlife refuge repair, and wildlife refuges are very important to a lot of Americans and seeing that they are properly maintained is important. You scheduled 40 minutes of debate on that, and yet you cannot find time to have a debate on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

We found time to talk about the Waco Mammoth Site Area Study. They want to see whether or not they want to put a park there. You scheduled 40 minutes of debate, yet you cannot find time to have a debate on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

As a matter of fact, you found time for all of those things, yet you did not have time to let this body decide whether or not we wanted to vote to kill the whole base closure process.

I particularly think base closures is a particularly dumb idea. It is not saving the taxpayers a dime; it puts a heck of a lot of people out of work. It has lost us vital defense installations like Cecil Field outside of Jacksonville, Florida. Three 8,000-foot runways, another 10,000-foot runway. Right now our military is looking for a place to put the new Joint Strike Fighter, they are looking for a place to put the F-18 E and Fs, and they are going to spend billions of tax dollars to build a brand new field for them when Cecil Field would have been a perfect match. The problem is that a previous round of base closures closed Cecil Field, and we gave the property away.

That was not done just once or twice; it was done over a hundred times around the United States of America. Places like the Presidio in San Francisco, given away. Places like Governor's Island off New York City, just a month ago the President gave it away. I was stationed on that island. It is probably worth half a billion dollars. The President gave it away.

Time after time, the so-called savings of BRAC were not; but there was one thing they did not tell the American public, before they gave these properties away, they had to clean them up. And we spent over \$13 billion of money to clean up bases that were given away so that the local governments could do what they wanted with them. In many instances, they sold them, and their city reaps a profit.

Mr. Speaker, you find time for a lot of fund-raisers and charitable events, and that I applaud. I would hope in the time remaining when you are Speaker, and you are guaranteed to be Speaker until December 31, that you would find time for this House to vote on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution so this generation can start digging itself out of the label of being the worst generation.

There is not one parent in America who would walk into the local Cadillac or BMW dealership and say, I want the most expensive car on the lot, and you

can bill my 5-year-old 20 years from now when they are working, and let them pay the interest on it, too. There is not one American who would say I want the most expensive house in the county, I do not care what it costs because I have a 4-year-old grandchild, let them pay for it. But that is precisely what this generation of Americans is doing by running up \$5 trillion worth of debt in the past 22 years. There is no end in sight.

Mr. Speaker, if you care about kids and grandkids, if you really care about the future of this country that so many other Americans sacrificed their lives for, why not schedule a vote to see that it is here for our kids and grandkids? What is so terrible is not only owing that money, but until it is paid off, every single day, \$1 billion of the taxpayers' money is squandered on interest on that debt; and one-third of that interest is owned to German and Japanese lending institutions.

If the thought of two lending institutions of two foreign countries owning one-third of the American debt and being in a position to wreck our economy anytime they want, if that does not frighten the gentleman, I am sorry. It does frighten me.

I applaud the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the Blue Dogs for writing the Speaker and asking for a vote on a balanced budget amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am putting you on notice right now: I will not vote to raise the debt. Enough is enough.

□ 2000

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank my colleague for that historic lesson there. I happened to remember one of the happiest days in my legislative career here in this body was in 1995 when Speaker Newt Gingrich did schedule a vote on the balanced budget constitutional amendment and it passed with the required two-thirds vote. I remember one of the saddest days standing in the back of the Senate a few weeks later and watching it lose by one vote. If it had passed the Senate at that time, we could not have passed the budget last year that we passed and we would not be here tonight talking about asking for a new plan, or increasing the debt ceiling.

You could have borrowed money to fight the war. That is totally permissible. Emergency. But you could not borrow the money, \$750 billion, to give this generation a tax cut with our children and grandchildren's money. You could not do that, any more than State and local governments could who have to operate under a constitutional requirement.

That is what we are here tonight to talk about, and lest we get into what I understand happened last week when our colleagues were here and the next speaker came up and started lambasting the farm bill because it spends too much and, therefore, it too is contributing to the problems that we have with our debt ceiling. Criticism

has arisen that Congress has passed a budget-buster farm bill. Yet Congress has been passing ad hoc emergency assistance legislation for the last 4 years because direct payments to support farm income were fixed and did not increase when farm incomes fell. Ad hoc assistance has totaled \$28 billion on agricultural programs, \$36 billion when you include nutrition programs. I can show you CBO's estimates of the bill that passed and the President signed yesterday that shows that we will spend less dollars of our taxpayer dollars each year beginning this year, 2002, and each year through 2011 under the bill that the President signed yesterday. That is less dollars. That is not inflation increases. That is less dollars. Since farm prices declined in 1998, farm program spending has averaged \$24 billion per year. We will be below \$19.5 billion in each year projected currently under the farm bill that passed.

Many will say that is too much money to be spent. On that we can argue. We can argue that, yes, it is too much money to be spent, but not if you live in farm country, not if you have been experiencing prices received at the marketplace that approximate Depression-era prices. Does this farm bill solve all of that? No, it does not. But one thing it does do, it gives predictability to our farmers and gives us an opportunity to answer the long-term problem, one of which I hope the Senate will soon do, and that is pass trade promotional authority so our President and his representatives can sit down and begin negotiating away the tremendous amount of subsidies that are present in the world today, including our own.

The spending for this bill the President signed yesterday was approved in the congressional budget passed in 2001 that contained the \$1.6 trillion tax cut. The spending for the ag bill was in the same budget. Congress has stayed within this budget in passing the bill. New estimates have shown both the cost of the legislation increasing \$9.3 billion and the cost of current farm programs increasing \$8.3 billion. These estimates are part of the same economic changes that have contributed to the surpluses of 2001 becoming the deficits of 2002.

I do not stand here tonight to say we shut our eyes to any part of the budget. The farm bill we passed last week fit within the budget resolution we passed last year. It is not fair to single out agriculture for being a budget buster when we complied with the budget resolution if we are not willing to revisit all other tax and spending items that were included in the budget resolution.

That is why we have come here to argue that we need a new budget resolution that responds to the changes in the budget outlook which looks at the entire budget.

We on the Committee on Agriculture are prepared to do our share in making tough choices to reduce spending on our programs if it is part of a comprehensive plan that puts everything

on the table and makes tough choices across the board.

This seems to escape a lot of people. There are those that believe we should not spend one penny in subsidizing our farmers. They completely ignore what is happening out there in the world. When other countries have the advantage of a weak currency compared to our strong dollar, I do not care whether you are producing cotton, wheat, corn, sugar, widgets, airplanes, you name it, it is very difficult to compete when we have as strong a dollar as we have and other countries have weak currency. That is a temporary phenomenon. It was kind of like seemingly that our income, our tax incomes were going to go up as far as the eye could see because we have come through a very, very good period of economic growth. The 1990s were unprecedented in economic expansion and growth in this country. Some believed, I guess, that it would continue to operate that way, but then, lo and behold, the stock markets quit going up and started coming down and tax revenues came down and it should not have taken a nuclear physicist to figure that out. But from the standpoint of agriculture we are still out there competing in the international marketplace and it is tough going right now.

But I made the argument last week when we passed that bill with 280 votes on the floor of the House that perhaps it is not a bad investment for the American taxpayer to spend a few pennies of their hard-earned money to support an agricultural system that has given America the most abundant food supply, the best quality of food, the safest food supply at the lowest cost to our people of any other country in the world, warts and all, subsidies and all, expenditures and all. No other country in the world's people are fed within 1.5 percent of the GDP, gross domestic product, in that country as well as Americans are, including the cost of the farm bill.

Could we do better? I will never say that we could not do better. But I think that some of the criticism that we are receiving from that is criticism that should not be given with a full mouth, because many of those who are criticizing are completely ignoring the fact that our grocery stores are full, the prices at least as far as the farmer is concerned and, well, let us just be totally honest, as far as the cost of food to the American people, no other country in the world is fed within 1.5 percent of the gross domestic product, and I submit to you tonight that it is because of farm policy that we followed in the past.

Things like the conservation title of this farm bill, the largest single increase in the history of our country in one bill. Yet some who purport to be environmentalists are criticizing it. It did not quite do it the way they wanted it done. There again, that is the American way. Everyone is entitled to their opinions.

The research, another strong part of this farm bill, continuing to put some investment of our taxpayer dollars into research in finding new and better ways and safer ways to grow our food.

Rural development. Out in rural America, things are not all going real well. Whether it be health care, whether it be education, whether it be jobs, all are directly dependent upon a sound and healthy farm income and we do not have one. That is why I think almost two-thirds of this body and two-thirds of the Senate passed and why the President signed the bill yesterday.

But I repeat, tonight we are talking about the debt ceiling and I am not about to stand on this floor and be as two-faced as some of the leaders of this body are when they say one thing when they are talking 6 years ago and they say another thing today. Increasing the debt limit is serious business. Having a budget game plan for this country that will get us back into a surplus or balanced budget, not so much a surplus although I would like to see us run a surplus and pay down a little more of our debt, and I would like to see us address the problems of Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security and do that before we do some of the other things that we are now talking about doing with the current economic game plan. We are not tonight suggesting to play politics with the debt limit, and we are certainly not trying to force a crisis.

Again, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, we, at least a good number of us on this side of the aisle, are prepared to vote to increase the debt ceiling, but not \$750 billion, and not until we have a new economic blueprint in place. We do not think that is unreasonable. It is exactly what you as the majority party were saying when it was a Democrat in the White House, exactly what you were saying then. You were right then. I repeat, you were right 6 years ago in forcing President Clinton to have a new economic game plan that ultimately came and brought us to the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. You were right then. Why are you insisting on being so wrong today?

We are willing to support a temporary increase in the debt limit to meet the expenses of the war and allow government to meet its obligations, but hold off on a long-term increase in the debt until we have a plan in place. We do not want to force a default on the debt, but we do want to use this debate as an opportunity to reexamine our long-term budget policies. It would be irresponsible to provide a blank check for increased borrowing authority without taking action to protect taxpayers from even further increases in the national debt.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) spoke about the need of scheduling another vote on the balanced budget constitutional amendment. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) and others, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) on the other side of the aisle, are pushing for just that. I

hope we will see that vote later this year. We also would like to see some strong budget enforcement rules. They are just as important a component in restoring fiscal discipline and making sure the budget remains in balance once we have done the hard work necessary to bring it back into balance. The provisions of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 expire this year. Unless we renew our budget discipline, Congress will continue to find ways to break its own rules and pass more legislation that puts still more red ink on the national ledger.

Enforceable spending limits will serve as a fiscal guardrail to keep our spending within the Nation's fiscal means. The Blue Dog ABC's plan includes legislation introduced by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) which would extend and strengthen the provisions of the Budget Enforcement Act that are set to expire this year. This legislation is similar to budget enforcement legislation introduced by Budget Committee Chairman JIM NUSSLE, but extends budget enforcement for 5 years and adds several provisions to improve enforcement of budget rules and increase accountability in the budget process.

I know what Chairman NUSSLE wants to do. I think there are some areas that we can in fact have some bipartisan support for because having meaningful caps on discretionary spending, all 13 appropriations bills, meaningful so that we live within them, is something that is good budget policy and will help be a significant part of this new budget plan that we have talked about.

Again, I repeat, those of us on Agriculture do not ask for an exemption. Far from it. We believe that we should be part of any changes in the budget process, including the criticism that is coming of our farm bill from some of our foreign friends, competitors. We have no intention, at least the bill that the President signed yesterday, there is certainly no intention by the President of the United States and no intention of the House Committee on Agriculture that we would not live up to the agreements that we have signed and agreed to live within and under in previous trade negotiations. What we said this time, though, is that we intend to have our negotiators negotiate from strength. We are allowed to spend in support of our agriculture in this country \$19.1 billion per year. We do not intend to spend \$19.1 billion, or less if necessary, and I hope it is necessary that we spend less, because one thing I hope the general public understands, the only reason we are having spending at the level that we are today in support of agricultural products is the fact that we have Depression-era prices.

□ 2015

Cotton is selling for 30 cents a pound and less; wheat, less than \$3 a bushel; and corn, about \$2 a bushel. These are the same price levels that we saw back

in the 1950s. If one's salary was 1950s vintage, one had better be a lot more productive today than you were then, or you would not be making too good of a living today. That is why, if prices go up, the amount of subsidization goes down.

Certainly I think the whole world would be better off if the amount of subsidization goes down, not up. We are perfectly willing, in the next round of negotiations, assuming the Senate will get on with doing their job in passing the trade promotional authority and we can get on with the negotiating, to reduce the amount of eligibility of subsidization in the United States on a par basis with other countries. The same is true on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS), let me just conclude by saying that there are a significant number of Democrats who would be willing to support an increase in the debt limit as part of a responsible plan to restore fiscal discipline. The approach outlined by the Blue Dogs, an immediate, temporary increase in the debt limit with a larger increase allowed as part of a plan to put the budget on a path to balance, accompanied by strong budget enforcement legislation, provides a road map for a bipartisan solution to our fiscal problems and gridlock on the debt limit.

That is our offer. We think it is a reasonable offer. We would like very much to be included in being part of the solution, because borrowing another \$750 billion on our grandchildren's future is not the best option for us to be considering in this year of 2002, one of those years divisible by 2.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS).

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. The experience and wisdom that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), my good friend, brings to this body is invaluable, and I have watched him very closely since I have been a Member of Congress, almost 4 years now, and I have followed his lead as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and our standing leader and ranking member there, and one cannot go too wrong if one follows the reasoning and the thinking of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). So I thank the gentleman for his input tonight. As a member of the Blue Dog organization and one of the leaders of that group that the gentleman founded, I thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to speak tonight on such an important issue.

I know that we have been here week after week, night after night as a group to try to drive a message home, one that many times is not all that popular and not easy to accept. But when we took our oath of office I, for one, took it very seriously to make sure that the citizens in my district, in my State, and in this Nation absolutely understand the truth and the numbers that

we are dealing with and that the decisions we make each day reflect what accuracy is all about, and that we project that on to the taxpayers, to the voters, to the general public.

The Blue Dogs have consistently focused on fiscal discipline, having always advocated honesty and responsibility in the budgeting process. When Congress considered the budget last year, the Blue Dogs warned about the danger of making long-term commitments for tax cuts or new spending programs based on projected surpluses. Now, in less than a year's time, we have seen a dramatic reversal of the once promising budgetary outlook. We now face projections of deficits and increasing debt for the rest of the decade that go far beyond the temporary impact of the economic downturn or cost of the war on terrorism, which we all support and which we must address and do it quickly and effectively.

Congress and the President, as the gentleman from Texas said, need to sit down, roll up our sleeves, and have an honest discussion about what we need to do to put the budget back in order, starting with the program that the Blue Dogs have outlined over the last several weeks, the ABCs of Fiscal Discipline. Remember, we are here to deal with the truth. The numbers that come into the Capitol's coffers, to the U.S. Treasury should be clear. There should not be all that much confusion on what we have on hand, what we have obligated to spend, and what we are thinking about embracing for future costs.

Now, there are a lot of things that have happened in the last year, in the last several months that have been unpredicted. Who would have thought we would have had the horrific events of September 11 that hurt our Nation in many ways, and it impacted us in an economic way. But we have other things that have happened: the recession, the tax cuts, and other spending that has been proposed and on the table now that we can control, that is within our control, and that is why I think people send us here to Congress to represent them.

My father is 81 years old, sitting out there now just recovering from a heart attack not quite 2 weeks ago. I remember his words and his generation, the elders of my church and the people that I think deal with wisdom more so than many of us in this generation. If you do not stand for something, you will fall for anything. Little did I know that a country music artist would come along and make \$1 million on that. If I had known that, I would have written the song if I had thought of it, I say to the gentleman. But it is so true. If one is not solid on something that is very important, a matter of one's convictions, and one does not try to pursue that goal in all the honesty and the fortitude that one can muster up, things go wrong. A lot of things come along that sound good and will divert you this way and that way, distract you from the real goal, from the real truth.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to accept sometimes what the real truth is, but the fact of the matter is, we have a huge debt, and we have to assure the American people that we will be honest and accountable. People out there that work hard and play by the rules every day, surely, surely their elected officials such as us that are here in this body can afford them accountability and honesty in dealing with the numbers.

The Congressional Budget Office has reported numbers; the Office of Management and Budget, the administration's fiscal reporting group, offer some other numbers. Remember, I come from the State of Illinois, but make no mistake, I live almost 400 miles south of Chicago. So it is really a different world which I represent, largely rural, small farming area, coal mines, small businesses, people that are just dedicated to generational hand-me-down crafts and work ethic that is invaluable and immeasurable. But when I served 14 years in the Illinois House, I saw the same thing happen there, the frustration of here is the Economic Fiscal Commission reporting how much money they predicted would come in or projected revenues or what is on hand, and then the Bureau of the Budget, the Governor's reporting office. Well, guess what? The Bureau of the Budget reported a year or so ago, almost 2½, 3 years ago when the Governor took office in Illinois that we had over \$1 billion in surpluses. Guess what they all can agree on now? Mr. Speaker, a \$1.5 billion hole in the Illinois budget, and they are like a lot of States scrambling to try to come to the rescue to know what to do. And then the decisions that they were elected to make become even tougher decisions.

What can we do? Well, I think we need to avoid what is always obvious. How would we in the world agree to the rosier projections of 5 to 10 years on the very best of what can happen, rather than preparing for what could be the worst? That is, to me, beyond reason and comprehension. So budget enforcement. Unless we renew budget discipline, Congress will continue to find ways to break its own rules and pass more legislation that puts still more red ink on the national ledger. Enforceable budget restraints will shine a light on deceptive practices and construct a fiscal guardrail, keeping our spending within the Nation's fiscal means, which is what we ask of the American people and families to do every year, every day, and what they do is stay within their means. Those that are not staying within their means have the credit card debt stacked up; they have marriages falling apart because of financial problems that they brought on themselves. What I have found in life is that most of the problems that come their way are not from some uncontrollable force; they are self-induced. We bring them on ourselves. That is what we have done here. Maybe it has taken decades and generations before us,

other people that have served, and other administrations, but we collectively, all of us, have to take responsibility. So now collectively, let us admit we have problems. We had September 11, we had recession, and we had tax cuts that gave 55 percent of the surpluses or more back, and now we have a problem. Where is the new plan? Where are the people that want to be responsible enough to step forward and say, let us sit down together as reasonable people on both sides of the aisle or Independent, whatever one claims to be, and work out of this mess. Not hope for the best and keep our blinders on, but what shall we do?

Well, we need a balanced budget constitutional amendment, which I have signed on as a cosponsor and feel should require the President and Congress to submit and to enact a budget that is balanced, without using the Social Security surplus. This amendment could be waived, of course, in special times of war or military conflict or threats of national security. But for the first time, all of the other balanced budget constitutional amendments have been presented without addressing whether or not we would use Social Security. This one we intend to bring forth to say we should not use the Social Security Trust Fund. We should balance the budget, and if we borrow from our children and our grandchildren, then we get ourselves in a deeper mess.

So I hope that the Balanced Budget Amendment, constitutional amendment, excluding the Social Security Trust Fund, would be one way that we can show, one way that we can have a plan as to how we intend to get our fiscal house in order.

I could say much more, there are so many other parts of the ABCs, but in order to give time for other Members before we close out our time, I will yield back.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to be a member of the fiscally responsible Blue Dog Coalition and to be fighting with the gentleman, along with my other Blue Dog colleagues, for simple common sense in budgeting. A lot of people think there is a lot of complications and complexities with respect to how we budget in Washington, but the way we do it should be no different than any household in America budgets, how any small business budgets. We have to make sure that we have the revenues. We have to make sure that the books are balanced. We have to make sure that the checkbook is reconciled at the end of the month. If we do not have revenues, somehow we increase them. I voted for every single tax cut we could because the American people need that kind of tax relief. Some say we have to cut expenses. What is there to cut? Are we going to cut prescription drugs? Are we going to cut Social Security? Are we

going to cut defense budgets? Nobody supports that. Others say we should borrow the money.

But there is another thing that we can do. We do not want to borrow the money. We do not want to ask our children to shoulder the burden for the fiscally irresponsible decisions that we make in Washington. There is another alternative. Once again it was brought to our attention in today's New York Times in a story by Paul Krugman called The Great Evasion. We are losing about \$70 billion a year in revenues by irresponsible and unpatriotic American corporations who rush off to Bermuda, open up mail drops in Bermuda, say that they are now doing business as foreign corporations and do not have to pay their fair share of taxes. They wrap themselves in the American flag to sell their products and then renounce their American citizenship to do business abroad and do not pay their fair share of taxes.

Now, there are colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have had enough of this kind of irresponsible behavior. Rather than increasing taxes, which so few of us want to do, and rather than gutting important programs, which so few of us want to do, it is time for the administration to step up to the plate and say, enough is enough.

□ 2030

We are not going to allow American corporations to run to these Bermudan tax havens, flee their fair share of taxes. No American family is permitted to do that. No American family was able to register themselves in Bermuda to escape their fair share of taxes. We should not allow American corporations to do that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, before I get into the main topic of this evening's discussion, that being immigration and immigration reform issues, I am compelled to respond to some of the comments made by our colleagues on the other side with regard to the budget dilemma that we all face here this evening. It is the dilemma faced every year, I suppose, and has for many many decades; and that is that we will always be spending more money in this body than we take in, or at least that was the case for all of the time, for the at least 40 years prior to the time that the Republicans took control of this body.

The Democrats, of course, ran an imbalanced budget for many, many, many years. And I am in complete sympathy with those Members of the Democratic Party who say that that is an improper way to run government; that, in fact,

we should be looking more to how businesses and industries run their business and States run theirs by having balanced budgets every single year. And I certainly completely and wholeheartedly agree. But I must say that as I listen to, on one hand, what I believe is an articulate plea for a balanced budget and, on the other hand, an articulate excuse for a vote for the farm bill which we just passed, it is hard to reconcile those two concepts.

This farm bill being, of course, one of the, percentage-wise, the greatest increase in any domestic policy program in, I think, history. I am not sure, but certainly in a long, long time. Widely criticized for being what it is, an incredible pork-laden boondoggle, and then to say in the next breath we have to do something about government spending, we have to control government spending.

And, if I may be so bold, I had to ask a staff person, because I am not really familiar with all of the variations of shades of different colors, and I asked one of the staff here a few minutes ago, What is the palest blue there is? And the young lady told me it was cornflower. Cornflower is the name of the color. Cornflower blue.

So I would suggest that the Blue Dog Democrats think about changing their names to the Cornflower Blue Democrats because they are not really Blue Dog Democrats. They are not really stuck to this issue of balanced budgets. What they are saying, I think, is that, and there are exceptions to this rule, that we are going to establish today, and, yes, I will yield to the gentleman who I assume is coming up to ask for that particular motion.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the good humor in which the gentleman is approaching the cornflower blue. But let me point out that the farm bill, the \$73.5 billion, the gentleman, I believe I am correct, voted for that budget that provided the \$73.5 billion that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and I, the speaker tonight, and others then proceeded to mark-up the bill. It was not called those critical comments when it passed as a budget, but it is only after we have put together the policy in which the criticism comes.

I would appreciate the gentleman acknowledging that as I was talking about balancing the budget, that I included farm spending in any reductions in spending that must accompany any kind of a new budget. That is what we are saying, and I do not think that is inconsistent at all.

Mr. TANCREDO. Reclaiming my time, and I appreciate the gentleman's observations, it is, of course, true that I have voted for a budget resolution that I wish we could hold to and this is a way in which we can all, I think, contribute to that possibility; and that is a vote against any appropriations bill that does not conform to that budget resolution. Any budget, any appropriations bill that puts us outside of that

scope which I intend, that is the way in which I intend to vote and have in the past voted.

I mean, we have to be, as I say, consistent with this because it is difficult for people who listen to this debate to understand that on the one hand we call for fiscal constraint, which I appreciate the gentleman has in the past and certainly even today has been a strong supporter of that issue, but we cannot accept that mantle of a fiscal conservative while at the same time doing things that bust the budget. But because of our issues, our individual concerns, the gentleman was very articulate in explaining the problems of the farm community in America, and no doubt his observations are accurate. But do you not see, every single person who is connected to any one of the various 13 appropriations bills we have here can come up, and do regularly, talk about the particular issue. It is the problem with education in America that we must, in fact, involve the Federal Government to the extent now that was never conceived of in the past.

We should both, I think, use the Constitution as a measure to help us determine what is an appropriate role for the Federal Government. And the gentleman, I must ask and I will yield for his response, what is the constitutional role of the Federal Government? Where in the Constitution does it set out a purpose for us to be the primary support for the farm, for the agricultural community? As I would say the same thing, by the way, in the area of education and Health and Human Services, I believe it is not there. I look at the Constitution. I do not find it. I find only a relatively narrow role for us, especially in the area of defense. Other than that, we could use that. That is the way we could defend our vote against these pork-laden, constituent-driven pieces of legislation that put us every single year in the position of saying, My stuff is okay. My stuff is appropriate. Everybody else's is out of the question and is a budget-busting bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say, in the Constitution there is a little part of it that says "promote the general welfare." And I appreciate the gentleman's pointing out that it is difficult to find supporting our farmers in the Constitution.

I do not stand on the floor and say that we are special or we are different than anyone else. Well, I guess I do. That was not a correct statement. I do believe that American agriculture and producers have done a pretty good job of feeding America and a good part of the rest of the world and do believe as we argued strenuously for the amount of money that was passed. So I guess, yes, I do, I do believe that.

But I also believe very strongly that anyone else that has an opinion should have the opportunity to stand and

make the same arguments. If I can get 217 of my colleagues to agree with me, it passes, and that is our system. If I might just continue. I want to get back, I agree with the gentleman, on the 13 appropriations bills, and that is why if the gentleman heard what we were talking about a moment ago, we think we ought to put a meaningful, reasonable cap on discretionary spending as part of the budget process. I think the gentleman and I will find, maybe not an agreement on the amount, but at least that we would find an agreement on the policy and procedure that we should follow to have a little bit of restraint.

I appreciate the gentleman's generosity. I appreciate the gentleman admitting that he voted for the budget that provided for the \$73.5 billion. So I take a little bit of offense when the gentleman stands on the floor as he did starting tonight by decrying this \$73.5 billion when he was the one joining, not with me because I did not support this budget, but he said \$73.5 billion was not an obscene amount of money for the budget we operate under.

Now times have changed; and, therefore, we are saying now let us take another look at the budget. If we need to trim, let us trim; but let us trim across the board.

Mr. TANCREDO. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his observations. Of course, times have changed and exactly that. First of all, we are talking about a \$73 billion maybe \$140 billion farm bill. There is a big difference there. It could go to \$140 billion. That was not in the budget resolution. And so to say that I have voted for the latter as opposed to the former is inaccurate, and I would also suggest that the gentleman is absolutely correct. If one can get the required number of votes in the House, one can pass anything. And I guarantee you, we have done it year after year, time after time. And it is the way, I understand entirely, it is the way the process is run. But I suggest that it should be perhaps incumbent upon all of us as we approach all of these bills coming up, the supplemental, I do not know, I think this week sometime, and a variety of other spending bills, I will watch for the Democrat and the Cornflower Blue Democrats to see how they vote because I will be voting "no" on all of them because I believe we should stick inside the budget. I thank the gentleman for his cordial relationship and his willingness to discuss this issue with me tonight.

I also remember thinking while I was listening to the discussion earlier here there was a comedian during the 70's and 80's. And his tag line was, "The devil made me do it. The devil made me do it." And he used to end his little skit with that all of the time. And of course, what he was saying was I did not want to do all of these bad things, but the devil made me do it, so it is okay.

I listen to all of this discussion about how bad it is to have these horrendous

expenditures and budget-busting bills all over the place for which my colleagues on the other side voted for most of the time as far as I can remember. And then to say, The devil made me do it. I do not know how we got here but this is bad, and somebody has got to impose some fiscal discipline on me. Somebody has got to make me behave. Somebody has got to make me say, you know what, I do not think we should vote for all this stuff. If everybody imposes a balanced budget amendment, then I will be able to take my medicine.

I am all for a balanced budget amendment, Mr. Speaker, absolutely. I will vote for it anytime, anyplace, anywhere. It is okay with me. But I think it is just the funniest thing in a way to listen to people who, as I say, from the other side of the aisle especially, and talk about budget constraint and fiscal responsibility, the devil must have been making him do it here for 40 years before we ever came in control in this body and now they want to seek forgiveness. Well, the Lord says that that is possible. So who am I to suggest that they are not truly repentant?

On to another issue, the issue of immigration and, specifically, immigration reform. In the past several weeks we have passed legislation in this body, and, as a matter of fact, yesterday the President signed a piece of legislation into law that will have the effect of tightening down on what heretofore can be described only as the most liberal immigration policy in the world of any country in the world. It is almost a misnomer to indicate there is an immigration policy in the United States because that implies, of course, that we have control over the process; that we establish how many people are going to come into the country every year like every other nation in the world does. We control it. We know who is coming in. We know how many. We know what they will be doing here. We know when they leave. I say that is the implication of saying you have an immigration policy.

The reality, of course, is we do not. We have not. And even the passage of this recent legislation euphemistically called the Border Security Act, we will not have accomplished the goal of border security.

A couple of weeks ago the House passed a bill by an overwhelming margin that was designed and is often referred to as the abolishment of the INS and the creation of a new body. Well, of course, it really was not all of that. As is often the case here, we have a tendency to name things, I guess, a little euphemistically and to create these illusions about what we do here.

Now, the reality is we passed a very tepid bill designed to reform the INS, the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

□ 2045

Much more needs to be done to actually reform that organization, much

more than what we did in our bill in the House. In fact, what has to happen is that we must take from every agency presently charged with responsibility for border control, that being the Customs under the Treasury, Agriculture, a variety, DEA, all kinds of agencies have border control responsibilities, of course Border Control under the INS. The Forest Service has some responsibilities in areas. We have national forests that adjoin international boundaries, and what we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to consolidate all of those agencies, all of these parts of agencies into one agency, with a clear mandate, with a very clear line of authority, so that everyone who works for that agency knows exactly what they are supposed to be doing and know that they have the full support of this Nation in that endeavor. That agency should be put into the Homeland Defense Agency, should be run out of Tom Ridge's shop or whoever is the subsequent head of that organization.

That is what we should do. That is what everyone who studies this area understands needs to be done. Now, we did not do that. We did not do that in the bill we passed in this House. We split the agency into two, which is good. We said they are going to have an enforcement responsibility and they are going to have what I call the immigration social worker side of things, the welcome wagon. Those will be the two separate responsibilities. They will be reporting to two different chiefs who in turn will be reporting to a single individual in the Department of Justice.

That really is not a lot different than what we already have. It really is not because among other things almost all of the people who will be running those two separate organizations within Justice are the people who are presently running the single organization we call the INS. Names will be the same but titles will be different, and we assume that by changing someone's title we will change their attitude or improve their competencies, but my colleagues and I know, Mr. Speaker, and I think the American public understand fully well that just changing titles will not change the way it is run.

Unfortunately, today within the INS we have people who are not, number one, competent to do the job and it starts from the top. The gentleman, very nice gentleman, Mr. Ziglar, whom I have nothing against personally, seems like a very pleasant individual. Unfortunately the water is so far above his head in trying to operate this agency that it is almost pathetic.

Mr. Ziglar was appointed several months ago because he had been the doorkeeper of the Senate. That was his job before he became the head of an agency with 30,000 people and an \$8 billion budget. He should not be there. He is not able to run the agency. He is not able to run it because the force of his personality cannot control it, and secondly, he is not able to run it because of course it is an enormous bureau-

cratic organization, moribund, plagued with inertia and internal incompetence and protected by Civil Service.

So even if we had some of the finest people, even if we had someone with enormous capabilities as head of the organization, their ability to actually change the course of this big ship, they could be turning the wheel as hard as they can and they will notice that the bow hardly ever moves because all of the people are turning the wheel as fast as they can, they realize there is nothing connecting the wheel to the rudder. It is going its own way, and that is a problem, and it will not be solved by the bill we passed in the House.

Here is the rub with that particular bill. It is going to the other body and it will not be improved. It will not be made better. We will see a conference report on this. It will pass and it will be something far short of what we passed in the House, and then we will all walk away from here and tell our constituents not to worry, we voted to abolish the INS and we are going to construct a really great agency to handle this problem.

Okay. That is the problem. That is a big problem, and I ask my colleagues to just think about that for a minute over here, that the INS today, regardless of what we pretended to do in the House, abolishing the INS, that was the way it was presented to us, regardless of that, regardless of the words we used, the reality is we added a lifeboat to the Titanic. I voted for it. It is a pretty good idea. I think it is a good idea. In fact, who would say we should not have added lifeboats to the Titanic? That would be good. I voted to do it. It is not going to stop the ship from sinking.

Yesterday in the Rose Garden the President signed a bill that, as I mentioned earlier, called Enhanced Border Security, and it is adding a couple of more lifeboats to the Titanic. It is good. Glad we are doing it. It will give us the ability to track people eventually. 2004, 2005, it will give us the ability supposedly, and we have done this before actually. We have actually mandated this before, and nobody ever carried it out, so we will see. If agencies carry out the law, it will give us the ability to track people who come into the United States. People who request a visa will actually have to have some sort of identifier, a biometric identifier, which is a term for fingerprint probably. Eventually other maybe more sophisticated approaches but initially fingerprints. So we will know if, in fact, the person asking for this visa is, in fact, who they say they are. That is good. Good idea.

Also, schools will be required to participate in this and tell us whether people who are here on student visas are still in school. We have done this before. Everybody complained. We pulled back because the schools said, please, we do not want all that paperwork and what if it discourages all our foreign students from coming here. We make a

lot of money, and we said, okay, well, never mind, we are going to try again. Try again when students were not coming to class, when they were not educated anymore in the course work. That will be good. I am all for it. Another lifeboat.

It will create a database that will allow various agencies of the Federal Government, the FBI and the INS and everybody, to identify potential terrorists or people who pop up on a terrorist list. We will be able to go and this name will come up, and it will say, oh, that guy came into the United States, or lady as the case may be, on such and such a date and he is here or he has gone, and that is good. I am glad.

We will still have, by the way, Mr. Speaker, we will still have the visa application that anyone can go to the Web site for the State Department and look this up. I love it. This is great. I always think it is a metaphor for the entire INS debate. It is called the temporary visitor visa, and it says about the third or fourth question, I am paraphrasing only slightly. It says are you a terrorist; are you planning to come into the United States and blow things up and commit acts of terrorism; have you committed acts of terrorism in other countries; are you a member of the Nazi Party. It is all one series of questions, and then the person checks over one box, yes or no.

So this potential terrorist says, yeah, I am, I am terrorist, I am a member of al Qaeda and I am coming in to blow up a building or distribute some sort of biological warfare agent, and at the bottom of this visa, because of the efforts of a Member of the other body from Massachusetts, very big Member of the body, there is an additional little asterisk and it says, after you answer yes or no to this question, are you a terrorist, if my colleagues go to the bottom and it says answering yes does not mean that you will be denied access to the United States.

So we still have that, but now that is okay because we will know if the terrorists come in, they will sign up. Naturally, they will say of course I am coming in, I am a terrorist, here I am and here is my terrorist credentials, and I am coming in to do a lot of damage.

Now, for those folks who admit to being terrorists this is a good idea that we have them register. I am all for it, but supposing, just supposing, I mean, I know this is a great hypothetical, but just supposing a potential terrorist decides to come into the United States and not sign up as a terrorist, not actually apply for a visa, now my colleagues say that cannot be because of course everybody coming into the United States applies for a visa, comes here as a visitor, a guest of the United States, tells us who they are, where they are going to be and for how long.

I say these things, of course, with tongue in cheek because everybody knows that our borders are porous and that only our most honest people in

the world for the most part say they are coming in, especially to apply through the regular process, but of course millions and millions of others come in a different way. They do not wait, they do not waste time filling out visas, requests for application to the United States. They come across the border.

These are two pictures of the border along the Arizona-Mexican border near Nogales, Arizona. We took them a couple of weeks ago when we were down there on a fact finding trip. This barbed wire fence, if it can be distinguished on the television, I am not sure, here, that is separating Mexico on the other side of this fence from the United States. Down here, same thing, barbed wire fence, but there is only a cattle guard separating Mexico from the United States.

This part of our border is actually more demarcated, more defined than many parts of the border that have absolutely no distinguishment, here and on the Canadian border. We have 1,900 miles in Mexico of the border and 4,000 miles on the northern border.

I guess I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when I hear people on the other side, people on our side, people in the administration, people talking about the fact that we should not try to connect immigration to terrorism, because most people come into the United States and they are completely and entirely looking, they are mostly looking for a good job, a way to send some money home, and they are not looking to do us damage, and this is absolutely true. Undeniably true, but of course, there are people who come into the United States for other reasons, and when they come into the United States for other reasons, may I ask my colleagues if they think it is logical for us to assume that they are all going to come via a visa process, especially when we start to tighten it up.

The 19 hijackers who committed the atrocities here in the United States in September were all here on visas. Some of them of course overstayed their visas. Some were here fraudulently, but they were all on visas. If we make it tougher for those people, Mr. Speaker, which I am all for, I am all for asking if you are a terrorist, please, let us know on this document, sign up right here, tell us you are a terrorist, and we can keep track of you. I am all for doing that.

□ 2100

But just supposing, I mean wildest stretch of your imagination, supposing they choose not to tell you that they are a terrorist and not to sign up that way on the visa. Why, may I ask, is it so hard to understand that there is a connection? Why is it so hard to understand that they would in fact come in a very easy portal, that they would walk across the border?

Here, this one on the bottom, the cattle guard, at least that protects us from illegal cattle coming into the

United States. This one does not even protect us from that because there is no cattle guard. It is just a big deeply rutted road. And by the way, this road is not on any Forest Service map. It does not exist on any map you have ever seen because, of course, it is just illegals coming into the United States.

And this is the greatest thing of all, Mr. Speaker. You know, you can go to our Web site, it is www.House.Gov/Tancredo, then you go to the immigration part of it and you will see all this stuff in greater detail, and I encourage you to do it because it is hard to see this. But here is a sign that is facing our side of the border, and it says here: "All persons and vehicles must enter the United States at a designated port of entry only. This is not," underlined this is not, "a designated port of entry. Any person or vehicle entering at this point is in violation of the U.S.," certain codes and blah, blah, blah, blah, and a \$5,000 fine or penalty.

This is on our side. This is facing the United States. Then it is printed down here in Spanish. I am glad they are letting people know. I know a lot of illegal aliens coming into the United States finally get on our side, turn around and look at the sign and say, "Oh, wait a minute, I guess I better go back. It says here this is not a designated point of entry." So certainly they are going to turn around and go back and find wherever that point of entry may be. Probably it is in Nogales. Yes, that is right, it actually is; and they will go on down the road certainly and they will enter the country legally. I am sure that happens a thousand times a day, would you not agree, Mr. Speaker?

Here they are not even able to see a sign such as this. They are not able to say, "Well, gee, after I cross this cattle guard, I see now that I am in the United States illegally. I best turn around and go back." And one reason why there is no sign here, Mr. Speaker, as they were often placed there, folks from the other side of the border, primarily Mexican police, come across and tear them down every night.

We actually got to the point, the Forest Service people, because this is right on the Coronado Forest, a national forest, where the trafficking in illegal aliens and drugs is so great it is destroying the national forest. The degradation of that national forest is a national disaster. But not one single environmentalist has spoken out against it, interestingly. Not one.

The tracks, as I show you here, go on up into the forest. They have worn footpaths through the forest that now make it look like cobwebs all over the forest. There is trash. It looks more similar to a national dump than a national forest. And they set fires, campfires; and then they walk away from them. And of course especially at this time of the year, and this year the drought being what it is, the day we were there and just as we were leaving a fire started, again by someone coming across illegally. They believe it is

UDAs, that is the way it is referred to, undocumented aliens, because it is in the very remote areas; and it had consumed 35,000 acres in less than a day.

I do not know where it is now. I do not know if it is contained. I do not know. We cannot even go in and use the most up-to-date methods of fire suppressants. We cannot drop slurry because there is so many illegals going through the forest that it actually may harm them. They may get some stuff on them so they do not drop it. And they only fight the fire during the daytime, because in the nighttime they have had fire crews up there and the crews have confronted armed men, people carrying M-16s, because they are the people protecting the people carrying drugs; and they are coming in huge bands 20, 30, 40, 100. The forest is being destroyed.

Here, people who are hiking, picnicking, whatever, around the national forest, could mistakenly enter into Mexico, you see, because there are no signs telling you, like this one, be careful, you are leaving the United States, you are going into Mexico. And they do. They go into Mexico. And the reason why is, and I started mentioning this earlier when I spoke of them tearing down the signs time after time, we have actually put up over here, just a little farther inside here, two metal posts, two big metal posts with a metal sign. That had been cut out. The Mexicans came across that night with a torch and cut the sign down, because they want people to wander over, then nab them and throw them into the local hoosegow and then extort money from them. It is a way of making a few bucks down there. They want people to wander in so that they can then say you are here in Mexico illegally and you are going to make you pay the price.

But there is no connection, Mr. Speaker, no connection whatever; and how can we even talk about things like immigration reform and terrorist activities? How could we suggest that there is anything related here, just because you can waltz across this border with great impunity? And believe me, hundreds of thousands of people a year come through right here, millions of people across the border, both north and south. By the way, this is not unique in any way, shape, or form to Mexico. Of course the greatest numbers coming through are Mexican nationals. But nonetheless, we have the problem on both our borders and in our ports of entry on both coasts.

Recently, 25 suspected Middle Eastern terrorists evidently came in on cargo ships. They are here someplace. We do not know where. I do not know exactly how we found out about it, but I am glad we at least know they are here. Makes me feel a lot better. And hopefully they will be caught. I know we are judiciously looking at everyone in the United States who is not here legally and returning them to their country of origin, so certainly in a short time we will have them.

We have a huge problem, Mr. Speaker. It is a national security issue. To suggest anything else is to be naive to the ultimate. And to suggest that we cannot clamp down on this kind of situation, we cannot in fact protect our own borders, even if it means putting troops on the border, because it will be insulting to Canada and Mexico, to suggest that trying to enforce our own borders and protect the lives and property of the people in this Nation is an act that would turn certain constituencies in America against us defies the imagination. It defies anyone's ability to actually and appropriately characterize such a position.

There are people in the United States of America, regardless of their ethnic background, who are opposed to their own government trying to protect them and their property? I want to hear that. Because most of the people, Mr. Speaker, I guarantee you, by magnitudes that are actually astounding to me, numbers that are incredible, tell me that they are asking more from their government in terms of protecting them, and they are asking us to do something to cut down on illegal immigrants.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is not just something that white WASPish Americans are asking for. This is something all Americans are asking for. Everybody. Because everybody here who has come here legally, who believes in the sovereignty of this Nation is saying to us, What are you guys doing up there? And I mean we are talking Asian Americans and we are talking Hispanic Americans. I do not care what the ethnic background. By and large these people support our efforts to try and actually do something about border security and to reduce even the amount of immigration.

A vast majority of the people in this country recognize that is necessary. It is not ethically driven. This is not racially motivated. This is a matter that strikes at the heart of everything we should be doing here in this Congress. We should be looking, first and foremost, at the security of the Nation. And you cannot go in front of your constituents, I do not care who you are or where you are from, Brooklyn or Timbuktu, no, strike that, Brooklyn or Ray, Colorado, you cannot go in front of your constituents and say that we have in fact done anything to significantly increase the protection of our borders and, therefore, your safety. Because we have not.

I repeat: the tepid bill we passed here on INS reform will be destroyed, I predict. And by the time we see it in a conference, it will be something totally different and much less dramatic than it was even leaving here, and that was not much.

I also predict that unless we do this, unless we actually reform the INS, actually create an agency that has the resources and the direction to protect our borders, and the commitment internally, the people working for it who

know why they are there, who are on our side when it comes to whether or not we should be letting people in here illegally, and our side means saying no, unless we do that, we have not done anything to improve security.

All of the other stuff we have done, including the bill the President signed yesterday, which I supported because it was that life boat, and I am all for adding another life boat to the Titanic, but it will not keep the boat from sinking. Signing a bill and calling it border security implies, I think, far too much. It is not security if we have an agency that is completely and totally incapable of actually providing that security.

We must reform the INS first. And I mean real reform. Then all the other things we do, all of the other jobs we give it in terms of tracking, all of the other responsibilities we give it in terms of protecting the borders, expanding our observation and control of the border activity, all of those things will be easier to accomplish with an agency committed to that task. Because I know this, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you, I have spent many hours with the folks who we give the responsibilities of being on the ground down at the borders, and they want to be supported by us. They want clear lines of authority. They want to be able to protect America. But they are working for an agency which is incapable of providing them with the leadership, direction, and resources to get the job done.

They will tell you personally, time after time after time, of the horrendous frustration they feel in trying to deal with this issue and do their jobs, do their jobs for their own families and for America. They want to do their jobs, but they are prevented from doing so because the agency itself is so incredibly, incredibly incompetent.

We will move just for the next few minutes to one final issue about which I am greatly concerned, and that is the issue of amnesty. We may talk about all that we have done in this body to protect the borders; but every single time we reconstitute, regenerate support for amnesty, every time that the administration pushes it, every time the other party brings it up, we are doing great damage to our ability to actually control the borders; and we are doing great damage to the moral character of the United States of America.

Here is why I say that. We call ourselves a Nation of laws. We tell the world to emulate us. We tell every country how important it is to disavow the rule of man and to accept the rule of law as the philosophy of government that all people should abide by and hearken to. And yet we suggest that 11 million people who are here illegally, who broke our laws coming into this country should be forgiven for that and given citizenship, in fact, rewarded.

□ 2115

Put them in line for citizenship ahead of all those millions of people

around this world who are reading the words on the Statue of Liberty: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free," and say how do I do that, I want to go there, I believe that the principles of the United States of America are the principles I want to live by; and I want to leave my country, I want to disavow any relationship, political relationship that I have with the country of my birth, and I want to start a new life in America, as perhaps your grandparents, I know my grandparents did.

We are telling all of those people every time we give them amnesty, we are telling all of the people who are waiting that they are suckers, and that the better way to get into the United States is to sneak in, stay under the radar screen long enough, and we will give you amnesty. It is a slap in the face to the people who have done it the right way, filled out the paperwork and waited the appropriate length of time, learned the language, learned our history, things we actually require of people coming into the United States. They did it right, and we are telling them, you are suckers. You should sneak in.

I know the allure is on our side. It is like the drug issue. We say there is the demand, there is always going to be the supply. There is the demand for cheap labor; and, therefore, they are going to come. I understand that part of the equation. I will be for any attempt on the part of the government, we have the laws, it is illegal to hire people who are not citizens of the United States or not here on the appropriate visa. It is illegal. Recently we finally started actually cracking down. I know Tysons Food and a couple of other big employers who acted covertly to bring workers into the United States for cheap labor are being fined. I would try to dry up the demand, but that does not excuse the supply. It does not excuse the fact that people come here illegally. We cannot reward them for that.

I am concerned because Monday, yesterday, President Vicente Fox said in a speech in New York, it may have been just a couple of days ago, President Fox of Mexico said the number one litmus test of our relationship with Mexico will be our willingness in the United States to give amnesty to the people who are here illegally. The number one litmus test.

One needs to ask himself, why would a President of one country demand from a President of another country the complete revulsion, if you will, of our own laws? Why would they demand that we ignore our own laws as a litmus test for their friendship, while at the same time, Mr. Speaker, at the same time they are asking for our friendship and declaring themselves to be the best friends of America on the continent?

We find that in calendar year 2001, Mexican government border incursions. Here is the seal of the President of the United States. This is the slide that I

was witness to, a slide presentation I was witness to when I went down to Douglas, Arizona. The briefing was presented by something called the HIDA, High Intensity Drug Area, and it is all of the agencies that get together and try to control the flow of drugs into the United States and the flow of illegals into the United States.

In their presentation they showed me this slide, and it says "Calendar year 2001, Mexican Government Border Incursions." I said Mexican government border incursions, what are you talking about? There were nine from the Mexican military and 14 from the Mexican police for a total of 23 in 2001. When I had a little more discussion about this, it turns out this is not unique in the year 2001; we have had over 100 such incursions over the last 7 or 8 years. The hundred have been documented. Many others go undocumented, we are told by the border police.

Some of these incidents have resulted in shots being fired by the Mexican military. Some have resulted in confrontation when guns were drawn on both sides, and finally people backed off. You have to ask yourself, what were they here for? What were members of the Mexican military and Mexican federal police doing in the United States of America?

I called the State Department, and they said they were probably lost. Probably lost? I do not suppose anyone wonders why we have 4,000 miles of border with Canada, much less defined, we have 1,900 miles with the border of Mexico, and we have at least 100 of these incursions by the Mexican military on the southern border, and I called the Canadian desk in the State Department and the Canadian Embassy and said, How many times have we had Canadian military wander into the United States getting lost because they could not find the line? They said never.

I said, How many times has the Canadian Mounted Police come riding across the border chasing someone and we found them in Detroit because they just got too far? It is not happening.

I will tell Members why it is happening on the southern border. Unfortunately, a large part of the Mexican military and the Mexican police establishment are corrupt, and they are coming across the border. Ask any member of our service on the border, any member of the border patrol there on the spot, ask them why it is happening, and they will say they are coming across to protect large shipments of narcotics coming across the border. Sometimes they come across to create a diversion pulling our people away from where that shipment is coming through.

Mr. Speaker, 90,000 pounds, and this is another slide. This is a gentleman coming through carrying several bags in these makeshift backpacks carrying drugs. This is Coronado National Monument, Arizona. This is May 7,

2001. Most come 20 or 30 or 40 protected by armed guards. In calendar year 2001, 11,300 seizures amounting to 2.476 million pounds of marijuana; cocaine, 42,000. That is just in this particular area, and I am just talking about the Coronado National Forest area.

Now, is this the act, I ask, of a friendly country? Why are we facing this is because President Fox, who I believe is a man who is trying to do a good job, I think he is an honest person; but, unfortunately, I do not believe he controls his own government. He certainly does not control some of the most important parts of it, including his own military. Corruption is so endemic, it is so bad that the President of that country cannot guarantee the actions of his own military and/or federal police. It is a sad commentary. I am sorry for him.

If I could wave a magic wand, Mexico would be a place with enormous wealth and a driving middle class, with everybody having the same chance to achieve their dreams and goals. But there is nothing that I can do about that, there is nothing that this body or the President of the United States can do to change the situation in Mexico.

The corruption is so endemic and it is connected to a government that still has connection to a socialist economic theory. The government still owns the oil company, for heaven's sake. While that is the case, while you have this combination of socialistic thought and socialistic economic thought and internal corruption, the economic prosperity of the nation will never, ever be achieved; and there is nothing we can do about it. No matter if we open the border tomorrow and walk away from every port of entry, which some would like us to do, even take away the barbed wire fence, for what little good it does, and walk away from the border. That is what some people want. Members know it is true. But it will not change the situation in Mexico. It will not be something that improves the lives of the people down there.

I am concerned that the Mexican government is not doing what is necessary to help us control our own borders. I am concerned that they are not helping us as the President asked them to do so. The President said, If you are not with us, you are against us. Then why are they not patrolling their own borders to stop incursions? Frankly, people are coming in through Mexico, not just Mexicans looking for jobs, other nationalities, Middle Eastern. One hundred ten Iranians were captured on a guy's ranch in Texas all dressed in string ties, white shirts and black pants thinking they could blend in, I guess.

This is a terrible problem connected to our own national security. It is also connected to the kind of country we will be, how many people will be here, the kind of environment we are going to leave for our children. Will it all be the environment that is today part of

that national forest which has been destroyed? Is that the kind of legacy that we want to leave? I think not.

We have to reduce immigration into this country. We have to reduce legal immigration to a manageable number; 300,000 a year is plenty. We have to put the same amount of effort into the protection of our borders as we put into the prosecution of the war in Afghanistan and around the world. We have to put the same degree of resources and the same degree of commitment into the defense of our own borders as we do to the prosecution of the war halfway around the world.

That may mean, as a matter of fact, troops on our border and demands to our neighbors, Canada and Mexico, to help us patrol it. It is incumbent upon us to do it, Mr. Speaker. It is our responsibility and no one else's. The States cannot do it. The Congress and the President must provide the leadership that the American people are demanding. We and the administration have to stop turning a deaf ear to the pleas of our countrymen to protect and defend our borders.

□ 2130

MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the very serious problem that exists in the Middle East and to report back to the House with several colleagues this evening on a trip taken to Israel the weekend before last to express solidarity with the people of Israel and with the government of Israel in light of the campaign of terror that has been directed against them by the Palestinians. We will be joined later this evening by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), who has organized, or attempted to organize, this evening an Oxford style debate between those of us who voted in favor of a resolution to express solidarity with the people of Israel and those few Members of the House who voted in the negative on that question. Unfortunately, those that opposed the resolution of solidarity with Israel have chosen not to participate in the debate this evening.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. We are missing an opportunity, I think, to have a good debate and a good discussion regarding the right of Israel to defend herself and the position of America that in my view should be not to try to limit Israel's right of self-defense. But I am happy to report that the gentleman from Florida has arrived, the organizer of the discussion this evening and the man who tried to organize this Oxford style debate to his great credit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. We had scheduled it for 9:30. It is about 9:30. As you described, we made an offer and we actually had an agreement this evening to have an Oxford debate about the resolution. As many people who are watching and obviously as Members, we know that our normal debate that we have is not really debate. People almost read statements and they read them to each other and there is no discourse. I think those of us who supported the resolution, many of us sat through literally several hours of debate and at some level a great deal of frustration, because people say things that there really is no opportunity to ask them to respond to try to clarify their position or really even ask them to defend their position. So we had set up this where under the House rules there is an opportunity for an Oxford style debate to interact with Members. We offered that opportunity and again, I guess there were 21 Members that voted against the resolution and 29 that did not vote. It is less than 15 percent of the membership of the House, but a sizable number of people.

We had the opportunity to cancel this evening or go forward, and what we thought we might do is in a sense maybe try to even literally re-read some of the arguments that the opponents of the resolution made and really in an attempt to maybe flesh out what their thoughts were. I think those of us who will be here this evening defending the resolution obviously find it hard to articulate their positions. Maybe they are in fact positions that cannot be articulated.

I would like to start maybe this evening and read one and I have a number of quotes from opponents of the resolution and there is no point in mentioning names but you might remember this one. It was in a poem that was spoken by a good friend and a good colleague of ours whom I respect on so many issues but I was extraordinarily disappointed with his comments.

By poem he stated, "Oh, little town of Bethlehem, we witness and we cry, Israelis and Palestinians, both practice eye for eye."

Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania would want to respond to that statement.

Mr. HOEFFEL. What struck me as off-target with that statement was the notion that there is some kind of equivalence here between the behavior of the Palestinians and the behavior of the Israelis. Our colleague who said that, who is a fine Member of this House, seems to feel that there is some moral equivalence between the actions of the two sides that he stated. That does not persuade me, Mr. Speaker, because what we are seeing on the side of the Palestinians are acts of terror directed intentionally against innocent, unarmed Israeli civilians, men, women and children. What we are seeing from the Israeli side are acts of self-defense, military acts by the armed forces of

Israel, but acts that are not designed to kill Palestinian civilians in some kind of retribution but acts by the Israeli army to defend Israel.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If the gentleman will yield, I think there are so many parallels between what the Israelis did with their incursion into the West Bank areas and what the United States did with our incursion into Afghanistan. This poem, I think, would in a sense give the same moral equivalency to the murderers who attacked the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and the plane that crashed in Pennsylvania with the United States military action in Afghanistan and really trying to set up a moral equivalency of that. There is a fundamental difference.

Again, these are different Members that spoke during the debate. I am going to quote another Member: "I thought there was one thing that might turn the tide in this struggle and it was a horrible tragedy in the end of March." And he showed a picture that actually was on the cover of Newsweek magazine, I believe, of two young girls.

"Look at these two young women. They look like sisters. One, Ayat al-Akhras, 18, was a suicide bomber who killed Rachel Levy at the grocery store, age 17. I thought that both sides would be so appalled by this unbelievable tragedy and see the hopelessness of this that they might turn toward peace. But, no, that has not happened there."

If we can, maybe if the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) can respond.

Mr. WEINER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield, what is interesting, I would say to the gentleman from Florida, that that dynamic has been portrayed several times in the media, that there are so many parallels between the 17-year-old that straps dynamite to his or her chest and the 17-year-old that might have been taken as an innocent victim. But the fact of the matter is that that suicide bomber, that homicide bomber, is bringing the Palestinian people further, not closer, to their objective of having a homeland. I do not think any of us would agree in this body that if the Palestinians announced and did more than announce, they actually began to operate without violence and to sit down and really negotiate for a Palestinian homeland, if they would have done that arguably years and years ago, it would be a reality today.

We have to recognize one thing that some of my colleagues did not recognize in the debate. Someone who blows themselves up and anyone around them blows them to bits is not engaged in political speech. They are not engaged in debate. They are not furthering the cause of bringing the two sides together. What they are doing is murdering people.

We have to recognize what sometimes often gets overlooked is this notion that someone who is engaged in

suicide bombing is acting out of desperation that was created by another set of instances. There are all kinds of circumstances in the world that have been resolved without suicide bombing. In fact, most political conflicts in the world, thank God, do not result in one group of people attacking the civilians of the other side.

Mr. HOFFFEL. Would the gentleman agree that the whole phrase of suicide bombing is also missing the point here? When I hear the phrase "suicide bomber," I think one person committed suicide. I think the gentleman used a separate phrase a minute ago that is a lot more illustrative of what is actually happening here.

Mr. WEINER. Let me give an example and the gentlemen in their most recent visit, I am sure, visited some victims in the hospital. I had the opportunity to visit a 15-year-old girl who was the victim of a homicide bomber. She was not killed, thank God, but she showed me her x-ray that included in it 18 hexagonal nuts that was packed around dynamite that were used as projectiles projected into her young body. This is savagery. This is not something that brings the debate any closer to closure. It is not something that brings the two sides closer.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If I could interject, again I am trying to bring quotes in from the debate against the resolution and this is again from a very esteemed colleague of ours, someone whom all three of us I know respect a great deal, but his statement was, and I am quoting, "Generations of Palestinians and Israelis have suffered in the region, but the violence of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict cannot be examined or addressed in isolation of decades of occupation of millions of Palestinians."

I think it ties directly to what you are saying, that in some way occupation justifies suicide bombings.

Mr. WEINER. We heard similar language throughout some quarters of the Arab world in reaction to September 11, is that this is what happens if you do not have an energy policy we like or a foreign policy or an agricultural policy, we send 15 suicide bombers to murder 3,000 Americans. We have to recognize, and we have to be able to separate. This is at its fundamental element a complex and gut-wrenching dispute over land. It is difficult. We have difficult political subtexts. We have biblical subtexts. We have historical subtexts. But these things cannot be resolved in an environment where one side is attacking the other side in the most savage and most despicable ways.

Mr. DEUTSCH. I think one of the interesting things, just in response to that exact point is that at the Camp David negotiations the Israelis were willing to give up and, in fact, offered 97 or 98 percent of the West Bank and Gaza and if you include some of the transfer of land in the Negev, effectively 100 percent of the land mass that is in a sense occupied. That was offered and it was rejected. So if the cause of

the disturbance is occupation, the Israelis offered to end the occupation.

Mr. WEINER. I would go even further than that. You do not need to go to Camp David at September of 2000. You can go to the Oslo process that began in 1993 that had the Israeli government entering into an agreement to end the occupation, to not only begin to foster democracy in the Palestinian region but to fund it. Many of the guns being used against Israeli soldiers today were provided by the Israelis because the Palestinians said we need a police force. The Israelis not only gave them uniforms and gave them funding but gave them the actual guns. You can go back to 1948, the birth of the Jewish state, where it was the Israelis who were prepared to say, listen, we will take a divided neighborhood, essentially, if it guarantees us peace. You can look at the Wye River agreement. You can look at the Mitchell plan. You can look at the Tenet plan. You can look at plan after plan where it was the Israelis who said yes, and it was the Palestinians that said no. But they said no because the only thing that it really was predicated on was peaceful coexistence, which leads one to believe that ultimately the Palestinian people themselves have to make a decision. They have to make a decision, do they want to continue to cross swords or do they ultimately want their own state?

I think the Members who are here on the floor would agree that if this was a peaceful struggle, it would have resulted in a Palestinian state generations ago.

Mr. DEUTSCH. It is funny, not funny but tragic, that if it was a Martin Luther King instead of a Yasser Arafat or a Gandhi instead of an Arafat, I think you are absolutely correct because the majority and even with the vote by the Likud Central Committee, which I think was a political statement, I as recently as today read polls of the Israeli public. The vast majority of Israelis support a two-state solution because they understand that is a solution, that there is a puzzle fit that works. That will happen at some point in time when there is a partner to engage in that solution.

□ 2145

The chart that I have up now, one of the things, had we been in an Oxford debate and had the other side showed up, was really the first chart that I was going to put up for today, and it is hard to read and hopefully the television camera is focusing in on it. But the Israeli incursion occurred on March 31. Prior to March 31, as many of my colleagues remember, starting literally 11 days or 12 days or 13 days before, there was a series of suicide bombings actually starting in March: March 2, March 5, March 7, March 9, March 17, March 20, March 21. March 27 was the so-called Passover bombing in Netanya where 27 Israelis were killed; and then the 29th, and then actually on the 31st was in Haifa, the restaurant that the

gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFFEL) and I visited or, actually, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and I visited. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFFEL) was actually at another place in that period when we were in Israel, but that we visited on that trip that occurred on the 31st. Then after that series of suicide bombings, killing over 100 people, I could count them up, close to 100 people, maybe 150 people during that amount of time, one of the numbers that I have talked about on several occasions, and I will put this chart up just to reiterate that, Israel in terms of population is about one-sixtieth, one-fiftieth, one-sixtieth the size of the United States of America. We are about 300 million plus people, 5 million plus, and the equivalent, just in terms of population, when 50 Israelis are killed, it is the equivalent of 9-11 to the United States of America. I am describing March. It was the equivalent of three September 11ths.

Now, we know what the United States did after September 11. We went 6,000 miles to a country and appropriately, and I do not think there is a Member of this Chamber who did not support, I do not think effectively as Americans we did not support what we did. Can we expect anything less for the Israelis to do, when three September 11ths occurred in the month of March in their country. I think that is the justification. I mean if a country is not protecting its citizens from death, from terrorism; I mean that is our fundamental role as government, and that is what they did. In a sense, they did not have a choice. The Israelis do not want to be in Bethlehem or Nabulus or Jenin any more than the United States wants to be in Afghanistan. We do not want to be in Afghanistan, but we are there for the reason that we have to be there, the same way they have to be there.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, something else that is important to keep in mind, in that period from October 2000 to today the Israeli government and the Israeli people have not only been fighting terror by military means, almost at the same time and, frankly, almost in a counterintuitive way, given the way we have handled our attack since September 11, is that they have continued to keep the doors open to negotiation.

For example, when former Senator George Mitchell, who has some experience in negotiating peace in difficult parts of the world, when he traveled there, he came up with some principles of a plan, essentially to start a framework to get back to peace. It was the Israelis who said, although it asked for very difficult concessions from the Israelis, including lifting up the roots of many Israeli families and moving them out of their homes, the Israelis said yes. The Palestinians, who had to do essentially one thing, which was to stop bombing and stop firing, they said no.

Then we sent CIA Director Tenet over to the area to see if they could perhaps get the wheels started to the Mitchell plan. Once again, asked tough things of the Israelis, including loosening up border crossings at a time when they knew terrorists were coming through those borders, Israelis said yes and the Palestinians said no. Even when Vice President CHENEY and Secretary of State Powell visited the area to try to negotiate peace, it was the Israelis who expressed a willingness and the Palestinians who would not relent in their violence. In fact, some of the worst violence in the area on the part of the Palestinians have come when U.S. emissaries, trying to negotiate peace, have been there.

So at the same time, while a great deal of attention has been called to the fact of Israel going door to door trying to rout out terrorism, it should not be ignored that even in that context, even in the context of all of the carnage over the last 18 months, the Israeli people and their government have still said, do you want to make peace? We are ready to do it. I think that is to their great credit.

Imagine for a moment if bin Laden or Mullah Omar presented himself next week and said, you know what? I want to negotiate. I want to negotiate the peace here. Maybe if the United States gives up Texas and Louisiana, I will leave you alone, and I do not just say that because they are Republican areas, I would say to the Speaker, we are prepared to have a negotiation. We would laugh at it. Yet, in Israel, despite the carnage that they have had, they have been negotiating at the same time, hoping against hope that the Palestinian people would choose peace over violence.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, if I could give the gentleman an individual example of that spirit of the Israelis, that willingness to remain positive and to maintain their humanity in the face of this horror, let me tell my colleagues about Gila Weiss, a former constituent of mine who graduated from high school in my district in 1988 when she was known as Jennifer Weiss. Her parents still live in my district, Fred and Susan Weiss. Jennifer moved to Israel, changed her name to Gila, and is making her life there. On April 19, 2002, she was shopping at the Jewish market the Friday before Sabbath, finished making her purchases, walked to the bus to get the bus back to her apartment and, as she was approaching the arriving bus, a woman stepped off the bus and blew herself up. She killed 6 people, wounded 40, Gila among them, using a suicide vest such as is pictured in the photo of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) that I know he wants to talk about in just a minute. But let me just tell my colleagues about Gila.

She survived that blast, shredded with shrapnel; her eyesight is still in jeopardy today, but the doctors are optimistic that she will make a full re-

covery and she will recover from the wounds that the shrapnel caused. When the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and I visited the hospital on our trip to Israel, Gila was there to greet us, showing incredible spirit, and indicated, without even being prompted, that in the face of this terror that she had faced and incredibly survived, that she did not harbor hatred herself toward her attackers; the individual, now dead, or the Palestinian people or leaders that sent that bomber to that bus stop in Jerusalem.

When I returned from my trip, I gave a report to my district and asked Mrs. Weiss, Susan Weiss, to be with me. She talked about the injuries and the terrible ordeal that Gila had been through, and her parents, and then Susan Weiss, unprompted, told the assembled press corps in the suburbs of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania that she harbored no animosity, that she felt that we had to move forward and try to figure out some way someday, somehow to return this process to peace. Recognizing the need for defense now, recognizing the need for safety now, the security of Israel being paramount, but both Gila and her mother were prepared, even though they have suffered the worst kind of experience with terror, prepared to move forward to try to reach peace.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that is important about the story that the gentleman has just told, the Israeli people, because of their fundamental belief in democracy, something that our country shares and something that over 373 Members of Congress recognized when the resolution passed, on the other side of this debate is a group of people, the Palestinians who, in their schoolbooks, in their classrooms, even on their television screens, are preaching hatred.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) made the mention of Nelson Mandela as a peacemaker. One does not have to go that far. One can look in that same region of the world not so long ago and look at the courageous stand of Anwar Sadat. One of the first things he did when preparing the Egyptian people who had been in a hateful, passionate war with the Israelis, one of the first things that he did as a sign of his courage that ultimately led to his death, is he turned to his own people in Arabic on Egyptian television and said, look, it is in our interests to make peace. We do not do it because we like them. We do not do it because we like their presence in the area, but it is because it is in our interests.

On the other hand, despite the requirement in the Oslo Accords that they stop teaching hate in their schoolbooks, they stop teaching hate to their children, the seeds of hate keep getting planted every day. This morning, if you flip on Palestinian TV during the cartoon hour, you will see commercials aimed at young children that have a playful song that says, put down your books, take up your arms, directed at

young children. We see protests in Nabulus. We have parents with their children on their shoulders, children like in all of our districts, except in these cases they have pretend suicide bomb belts around their waists.

The thing that I fear the most is irrespective of our intentions, irrespective of the feelings of the people of Israel and irrespective of even the best instinct of the Palestinian people, the seeds of hate that we are planting today among Palestinian children will take a generation to eradicate. That is the fundamental difference here. Someone should be held responsible for that, and I think that person should be that of the Palestinian Authority, Yasser Arafat.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman can yield for a second, trying to keep this in somewhat of a debate without another side being here, which I almost feel we should have an empty chair like they sometimes do in political debates when the other side does not show up. But it is interesting, much has been made in terms of who voted against it, why they voted against it, but there were Democrats and Republicans. Again, less than 15 percent of the Congress, but I am going to quote from one of our Republican colleagues and the quote is, "If we are going to bring peace to that troubled region, we must be scrupulously honest. There are piles of bodies in the Middle East, many of the victims of noncombatants, and both sides of the conflict have engaged in the slaughter of innocents."

Someone said that from the floor of this Chamber not that long ago, a week and a half ago. I see the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) shaking his head no. Now he has an opportunity to respond.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Florida, and this is something that is easily verified, there has not been a single instance in the history of the conflict where, with the possible exception being the preemptive strike in the war of 1967 that the Israelis have initiated violence. When we see these images on television of kids throwing stones at Israeli soldiers and Israeli soldiers responding, invariably those are organized efforts by Palestinian protestors to engage in a highly publicized exchange.

There is not anyone who believes, for example, that the Israeli military had any interest in going into Ramallah, for example, knocking on doors looking for terrorists, had it not been for the fact that there had been horrific slaughters of innocent victims, including those observing the Passover holiday.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, one of the things that I guess is frustrating, having sat on this floor and listened to the debate is the simple distinction that the gentleman is making. It is so frustrating that these are well educated, well

thought of, thoughtful colleagues who have made these statements that I am reading word for word out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the debate. When the Israelis went into Jenin or for that matter Ramallah or for that matter other locations, because I talked a couple of minutes ago about the reason for the incursion, that there was this horrific activity occurring at monumental levels in their society.

One of the things that we witnessed in our visit to Israel was in a sense the proof on the other side, and this is one of many pictures that we have. One of the opportunities we had was to view just a fraction of the weapons that were seized during the incursion, about 10 percent of the weapons. In this Chamber, if we added all the weapons that we saw, it would probably fill this entire Chamber. Weapons of mortars, and I will show some additional pictures of machine guns and sniper rifles. But I think the most evil was literally witnessing suicide vests, and they are not kids creating suicide vests. I mean as we saw them, and my colleagues can see in the picture, they are commercially made. We actually saw different versions, summer versions, winter versions, autumn versions so that they would not be seen. But, in a sense, that is the proof of why.

I guess the frustration that an intelligent person could make a statement like that or make some of the other statements that I have read, not to distinguish; in the United States, we call it collateral damage. In our military action, in fact our ongoing military action in Afghanistan, there have been innocents who have died. We did not go house to house in Tora Bora. We bombed, as we should, absolutely as we should, as was appropriate and with the knowledge that there would be some collateral damage because of the risks involved and the morality involved in terms of doing it, it was absolutely appropriate. The Israelis could have attacked Jenin the way we attacked Tora Bora. They could have bombed from the air without risking lives. There is no question that a number of Israelis, a significant number of Israeli soldiers died because of the effort that they made. I do not doubt, and in fact I am sure, there were innocents who were killed in the action in Jenin. But I think not to understand there is a fundamental difference between someone being killed in that action where, by all accounts, the Israeli defense forces' efforts to make sure that civilians were not killed are minimized. I mean there are just so many specific accounts. In fact, before the soldiers went into the battle, their orders were to do everything possible, put their own lives at risk in terms of avoiding collateral damage. One thing also, I mean there is a whole different viewpoint when it does occur. The attitude of the Israeli defense force is not just remorse, but it is a horrific situation. It is tragic. There is no words that can possibly compensate.

□ 2200

But the entire attitude is a totally different attitude. The efforts of a megaphone to tell people to get out. Give them another chance to get out. Give them a third chance to get out. Tell them what is going to happen if they do not get out and give them every opportunity to get out. And yet we are hearing colleagues say that is the same as a murder bomber.

Mr. HOEFFFEL. If the gentleman would yield, what our colleague is missing is the intention behind the actions. The actions of the Palestinians when they commit terror, they are intending to kill innocent civilians and the Israelis are intending to defend themselves. That is the fundamental difference.

The action that the gentleman describes and both gentlemen have referred to, the military incursion into Jenin and other areas of the West Bank first was designed to stop the terror from continuing to come against Israel. It certainly was taken at great risk to members of the Israeli defense forces and 22 Israeli soldiers died in Jenin and had the Israelis chosen to bomb I doubt any Israeli soldiers would have died. But it also uncovered an extraordinary number of weapons, as the gentleman has mentioned, most of them in complete violation to the Oslo Accord that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) described.

The Palestinian police under Oslo were allowed to maintain handguns, rifles and AK-47s.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If the gentleman would yield, this is as he witnessed himself, and this is just a very small cache of mortars which obviously are illegal under the Oslo Accord.

Mr. HOEFFFEL. Exactly right. That is a very good picture illustrating the point.

What the Israelis seized were anti-tank missiles, rocket-propelled grenades, mortars, rockets, all in complete violation of the Oslo Accord. All there, as our friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), said, who identified himself as a sportsman, not there for sporting purposes, not there for hunting game during the doe season with a license from your local State government, but they are to kill people. That was the purpose of those weapons.

And the suicide vest that the gentleman identified a few pictures ago was the exact type of vest used in an attempt to kill Gila Weiss and that did kill six of the people that she was standing around with, total strangers.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Again, I will try to use some of these posters today, but this again is a sample of literally weapons, just a fraction of the weapons collected that could fill this Chamber, machine guns, sniper rifles, mortar guns, anti-tank weapons, none of which were allowed under the Oslo agreement.

Mr. WEINER. If the gentleman would yield for a question. Perhaps you can offer a little bit more explanation.

One of things that came up frequently on the floor among the opponents of the resolution was that we have to foster an environment where the moderate Arab nations could help a peace take hold in the Middle East. Perhaps the gentleman could explain to the Members where those weapons came from. Did they not come from a so-called moderate Arab state? And I am curious as to whether it seems like the export of someone who is interested in peace in the region.

Mr. DEUTSCH. As we reviewed them, we asked exactly those questions. Some of them were stolen Israeli weapons. Some of them were American weapons stolen or gotten through a third party. A lot of them were smuggled either through the tunnels from the Sinai into Gaza. Some of them, Israelis have very good information to believe that they were actually smuggled in Yassar Arafat's helicopter. So the weapons came from a variety of different sources.

Mr. WEINER. What about the Karin-A?

Mr. DEUTSCH. The Karin-A is a totally different issue which we can talk about. I think it is a significant issue as well. As the gentleman is well aware, the Karin-A was a ship that Israeli commandos captured that had \$20 million of weapons in it and had some very sophisticated weapons right off the shelf from Iran, including rocket launchers, rockets, not just mortars but rockets. The equivalents of our TOW missiles.

I actually have some pictures because we reviewed not just the weapons, these were weapons that were seized in the West Bank up to this point; they were weapons that were literally seized during the military incursion. And that in a sense, just these weapons are success or proof of the right and the necessity of the incursion because the suicide belt we saw in the previous picture, that suicide belt was not made to be put in a museum. It literally was made to be used. And the capture of that one belt prevented that one belt from being used, and we do not know how many lives and how many tragedies, and literally the tragedies are each one is as painful as we can possibly imagine in terms of human condition.

Did the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFFEL) want to add something to that?

Mr. HOEFFFEL. Well, the enormity of this, it is hard to appreciate unless you see the weapons. And the great variety, from brand-new modern weapons never used before seized from the Karin-A with an attempt to smuggle them in from Iran, to old battered, well-worn weapons that the Palestinians have obviously been using for years and years to homemade weapons, weapons made with sections of water pipe and slingshots for the firing pins to set off the ammunition put in these homemade weapons. An absolutely staggering

commitment to mayhem, to using violent means to try to win their political goals.

The enormity of the terror is hard to grasp unless you see the weapons, unless you talk to the families of the victims, unless you see the locations of the terror bombings in Jerusalem as we did on our walking tour. And when we hear the stories of the families and the human tragedies of innocents dying, not soldiers dying in combat for their country but innocents.

We have heard the story of Michal and Malka, two 15-year-old friends, inseparable, went to school together, lived next door to each other, had known each other since both were babies, 15 years old. They snuck off to get some pizza last August at the Sbarro restaurant in downtown Jerusalem and got blown to kingdom come. Their parents buried them side by side where they will rest forever.

That is hard to understand. It is hard to appreciate the horror for those families and hard to understand how anybody can justify such action. You can have the world's most difficult grievance; you can be really ticked off about something, and feel that the other guy is causing you a lot of aggravation, but how can you ever justify murdering innocent civilians?

Mr. WEINER. If the gentleman will yield, there is a broader political point here as well. And that is the Israelis have arguably tried everything under the sun to deter these kinds of attacks. That did not work. Now they are doing what they can to respond.

Some in the Chamber last week or 10 days ago in arguing against the resolution said perhaps we should recognize the grievance of the suicide bomber, sit down at the table and negotiate with them.

What lesson does that send to the next guy who is going to fly a plane into a tall building in the United States? What lesson does that teach the person who is sitting at home in Nablus or in Jenin about whether or not they should go and take up violence, not only against Israel but against the United States or anyone else with whom they might have a grievance.

We have to be very careful when we do what sometimes happens in the State Department here in the United States and we offer this sense of we kind of understand where they are coming from when they blow up a bunch of children in a shopping center. I believe we embolden further attacks. I believe we make it steadily, piece by piece, part of the political debate. It was truly mindboggling for me to listen to it. And we should stress very few Members of this Chamber, the gentleman showed pictures of his visit to Democrats, to Republicans, overwhelmingly from all regions of this country, this House and stood up and said we understand what Israel is facing. We support her in perhaps one of the strongest pro-Israel resolutions this House has ever passed.

Imagine for a moment if we did it. Imagine if we were a little more lukewarm and said, maybe we see the beef that the Palestinians have when they engage in suicide bombings. That creates more violence. I remember distinctly in June of 2001, Tel Aviv discoteque bombing. Horrific event. Someone gets in line at a discoteque on a Saturday night, teenagers all around, blows themselves up, blows up over a dozen young people around them. Quickly the United States, even the European community, which has never been very friendly to Israel, editorial pages everywhere said how outrageous, how disgusting it truly was. What happened? Israel did not respond immediately, and the Palestinians also recognized, you know what, we have gone too far. We are no longer getting sympathy and now people are recognizing how bloodthirsty we appear to be. It created a week, maybe 10 days of quiet.

When we strongly condemn these things, when we do not prevaricate, when we do not equivocate, when we do not draw these lines of equivalency that somehow justify the lines of terrorism, we save lives. That is something people have to understand. When they stand here, it almost sounds as if they are justifying the violence. In the quotes that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) read, I think it really does embolden some 15-year-old young person to say, maybe this is the way I will get my meaning; and they will be the next homicide bomber. As we have seen from these weapons, and I have said it on this floor before, this is a problem for Israel, true. But just the way a katusha rocket can shoot down an El Al plane, it can shoot down a Continental Airlines plane, God forbid, or a U.S. Airlines plane, God forbid.

The same people who are getting these weapons, because they think murder is a way to get their means, believe me, we are not miles and miles away as we learned on September 11.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Let me read, these are different Members, every quote so far this evening has been from a different Member. I will read from another Member: "We in this body have a constitutional responsibility to protect the national security of the United States. This one-sided intervention in a far-off war has the potential to do great harm to our national security."

I think that is exactly the point that the gentleman is making. That if someone is saying that, what is the implication, that there really is a duality, that there is both sides? And I think what was said is that for an act of terror, an act of killing innocents there are no two sides.

This is just a follow-up. Literally just another pick of weapons seized and there are more and there are more and there are more. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) asked just a comment on the Karin-A issue, and I thought since it is a relevant event, in a sense it was not directly tied to the

incursion, but it gives a sense of the context to the Palestinian Authority and Yassar Arafat personally.

The weapons on the Karin-A were \$20 million of weapons but literally weapons off the shelf of munitions factories in Iran. Mortars, as we see, large mortars of different dimensions for different distances, rockets, the equivalent of the United States TOW missiles, which are missiles that can be shot and steered after they are shot, anti-tank weapons that were made out of plastic so they cannot be detected, a very sophisticated operation that the United States and the Israelis and the world has not denied that Yassar Arafat's direct involvement in the purchase and the logistics of these weapons.

The sophistication of the weapons in a sense is highlighted by this container. All of the weapons that were seized on the Karin-A were actually in containers like this, which are watertight containers. In fact, some of the weapons were actually modified so that they could fit inside these containers. And the containers themselves were very sophisticated in that they had a specially built compressed-air-water compartment that would actually be able to have the containers set at a certain depth in the Mediterranean Sea so they could then be picked up later on with this buoy attachment. And that in fact could have escalated the conflict dramatically. Every weapon there was in violation of Oslo. Every weapon that was there was in violation of Oslo.

Mr. HOEFFEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I could not agree more. The violation of law and the agreement represented by these weapons really goes a long way towards showing the attitude of the Palestinians toward the agreement that they made and their intention for their future use in the Middle East.

The other thing that was quite persuasive to our group were the documents that the Israelis seized from the Palestinian Authority offices in the West Bank during the military incursion. Documents were seized in Arabic showing how the terrorists are funded, showing how the Saudis make payments to the terrorists and the families of terrorists, showing how Yassar Arafat's organization submits memos to him recommending that payments be made to a list of what they euphemistically call "freedom fighters." That would be in American English "terrorists." And how Yassar Arafat signs off on those memos asking for certain levels of funding.

□ 2215

In most cases he reduces the payments to be made to each individual, but there are signed documents showing to my satisfaction certainly, that Arafat has been directing terror. Certainly through the Fatah organization, the Tanzim and Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigades that he commands as head of Fatah, and these documents and the

gentleman has a picture up, and I would yield back to the gentleman in just a second, the documents plus the seized weapons certainly make clear to me that Yasser Arafat has been directing terror in the Middle East.

I am happy to yield back to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I think the issue of the day and I think in a sense maybe if we move beyond the resolution and I think in a sense we have debated against the empty seat and we have debated successfully.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Would the gentleman agree we won the debate?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I think in the environment we are at we won when we entered the Chamber and I think it is important, and I hope there is a discourse because clearly a number of our colleagues, again less than around 10 percent or so, articulated a position which I am just disappointed, and I think it is by lack of information, it is a lack of thought, lack of really thinking through the actual conditions of what occurred.

We would not talk about moral equivalency with the United States war in Afghanistan, and the similarity parallels are very real in terms of what the Israelis are doing, and as we both have said, there should be a Yasser Arafat exemption to the war on terrorism?

I would like to follow up though, and really, the issue of the day is should the Israelis continue to negotiate with Yasser Arafat? Is he the negotiating partner to try to get to the resolution of the conflict, and as the gentleman said, not only did the Israelis seize a huge amount of sophisticated weapons in their incursions and suicide belts and other things, but a huge amount of documents, which at this point in time no one is refuting the authenticity.

In fact, we met the parents of a soldier who actually downloaded some of the documents and was killed in a subsequent action, and he told his parents about it. So I do not think there was a scam of him telling his parents about what he did.

No one at this point is really questioning literally the authenticity of the document that is blown up on this chart and in Yasser Arafat's handwriting, which again no one is questioning at this point in time, is exactly what the gentleman described. It is a request to Yasser Arafat from a senior Fatah activist, Hassan al Sheik, for payments of \$2,500 for three known terrorists. I mean, people who are on Israel's most wanted list who the Israelis knew were involved in previous terrorist actions, in fact, through the Israelis, subsequently eliminated, and a request for \$2,500. Chairman Arafat, as my colleague had mentioned, says allocate \$600 to each of them in his own handwriting directly involved in that payment.

There are other documents. This is a longer list of 12 people who were involved in terrorist activities and for

this group, I do not see the exact amount, but again, with Arafat's signature, it is a \$350 payment for terrorist activities.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman, does he think those payments are for putting a roof on Arafat's house?

Mr. DEUTSCH. I think what is clear is they are what they are.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Can there be any question about what those payments are authorized for, what the purpose behind them is?

Mr. DEUTSCH. They are what they are. Arafat, he was not a terrorist 10 years ago or 5 years ago or a year. He is still a terrorist. He was engaged in terrorist activity continuously, and his words might sound nice at this point in time, but it is not ancient history to go back.

Here is a document, a request from the Al Aqsa Martyr troops for money to the Palestinian Authority, and as shocking as each of the things are in terms of weapons, in terms of posters for suicide bombers, there is a specific request for 700 shekels, and I am reading it directly, this is for detonators for suicide bombers. We need every week five to nine explosive charges. Five to nine explosive charges every week, 700 shekels per week, directly to the PA by Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade, people who are literally perpetrating the suicide bombs.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, the documents do indeed speak for themselves and leave one just no choice but to conclude that Yasser Arafat has directed terror, that he has in the past and he presently is, and the question is for this House, for this country what needs to be done in order to stop this activity.

It seems to me, I know the gentleman and I have discussed this, that there must be a recognition that Arafat, other Palestinians and the leaders of the Arab league must declare that terror must be renounced, that violence must be renounced and they must do this in word and deed. They have done it in word, but the documents that the gentleman has and the photographs of the weapons indicate that indeed they are still involved in terror and in financing terror.

Mr. DEUTSCH. This is going to be the last document and there is more, but this is dated March 24, 2002, and during the stage of these operations, and this is a copy of minutes of a meeting at the Ramallah headquarters, and Chairman Arafat is in attendance at this meeting along with Hamas, and the statements in the minutes of the meeting in Arabic are such that Chairman Arafat is upset that there was a bombing inside the green line when General Zinni was in Israel, and the inference is they would have preferred the bombing outside the green line and not when General Zinni was in Israel.

The Israelis did not write this. No one is questioning the authenticity. This is Arafat inside his own meetings,

meeting with Hamas, talking about terrorist activity, not trying to prevent them at any level in any way, and we could ignore this if we want to ignore it, but the weight is so overwhelming at this point that it is unignorable.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is entirely correct, and it seems to me that we need to make clear that both the United States and the government of Israel need to have someone to talk to representing the Palestinians that clearly renounces violence, that renounces violence and terror and that does so in word and deed and who, secondly, clearly recognizes the right of Israel to exist as a Jewish state, not as a state that someday may have a Palestinian majority because of the demographics, but a state that is recognized as a Jewish state with a full right to exist in peace and security.

Until we get those two commitments, a complete renunciation of violence and terror and a recognition of Israel to exist as a Jewish state, I do not see how we can go forward. I do not see how the Israelis can go forward in furthering the peace process when there is literally nobody to talk to presently on the other side that has any credibility whatsoever.

Mr. DEUTSCH. The gentleman is so on point with that comment. That is one of the tragedies going on right now. In fact, one of the tragedies I think as we both saw is as horrific and awful and inhumane the Palestinian attacks on Israelis have been, both Jews and Arabs, and we made a point as we have talked about to visit Arab dictums of terrorist bombings. In fact, the restaurant we talked about in Haifa was owned by an Arab Israeli and about half the victims were Arabs, not Jews, Arabs and Jews. The screws and the nuts and the ball bearings do not discriminate and, too, they are going to maim and kill.

The reality of how bad and awful that is, Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian Authority have been as bad and maybe even worse to their own people, indiscriminately killing people in just no type of civil process at all, destruction of an economy, corruption at levels which is untold, probably unmatched almost maybe anywhere in the world the level of corruption, and that in a sense is the entity that the United States is supporting.

What we have talked about on this floor previously, there is no, and we use the expression, there is no daylight between any Members of this Congress and the President and the war on terrorism and the efforts in Afghanistan, the efforts to stop terrorists with global reach whether they be in Iraq, in Syria or North Korea. There is no daylight between us, but I think there are many in this Chamber, in this country unfortunately who disagree with some of the President's actions in terms of trying to say, well, Yasser Arafat and these activities really are not as evil as they are.

One of the great things about President Reagan was when there was an evil empire he called it an evil empire and the Palestinian Authority is an evil empire, and we can call it white and we can call it black. If we call black, white, it does not make it white, and the same thing by saying, the leadership and these other things, the entity itself is evil, is corrupt beyond comprehension. We both heard stories that I would not say on this floor of some of the activities of the Palestinian Authority in terms of some of the behavior of some of the leaders that were beyond human discussion.

Let me follow up, though, just in terms of the Palestinian Authority itself. This is a reprint of a New York Times article April 20, 2002, and they interviewed a printer in the West Bank who had an ongoing contract with the Palestinian Authority to, after every suicide bomber who was killed, to automatically within several hours with information about that suicide bomber print up 1,000 posters to then be put up. This is just a sample form. That is the entity, the glorification of the suicide bomber is what we have seen.

Mr. HOEFFEL. We face the reality of what to do now. There can be little doubt regarding the complicity of Arafat in the terror. He is continuing to call for martyrdom for the Palestinians, and in the lexicon of the Palestinians, one who is a martyr is one who commits terror and is willing to die in committing that terror against Israelis.

What the gentleman and I need to do is to urge this House and our administration to clearly set out the conditions that need to exist before Israel can be expected to go forward, before the United States government can be expected to go forward.

We all want peace. There is no question about it. Even the Members that voted against this resolution certainly want peace. There is no question about the motivation. The disagreement can be in how to get there, but what conditions do we need to set forth?

I have stated, too, I am sure the gentleman could add, the absolute need for the Palestinian leadership and the Arab league leadership to renounce terror and to recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

I know the gentleman has got additional views on what must happen next before we can go forward. I would be happy to yield back.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I know our time is running out. I want to give both of us a couple of seconds to close, and the last two charts are directly on point on what the gentleman mentioned.

Yasser Arafat in the compound spoke about sending a million, the English translation is as my colleague so ably pointed out, martyrs to Jerusalem. The Arab word is "shaheed." If my colleagues were to ask any Palestinian what shaheed means, they know that it means suicide bombers. It does not

mean martyr. It is not an esoteric, theoretical term. It means suicide bombers, and specifically to the people that is what they hear.

As shocking as that is, the quote from Chairman Arafat's wife, literally that there would be no greater honor than for her son, if she had a son, to be a martyr, to be a shaheed, to be a suicide bomber.

I would close and give the gentleman an opportunity to close and say I wish that we had a discourse this evening with our colleagues who voted against this because I do not think there is any articulated, rational, moral position against the support of Israel that this Congress overwhelmingly and this country has overwhelmingly done.

□ 2230

Their fight is our fight. The attacks against them are attacks against us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOEFFEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, Mr. Speaker, and let me make one more comment.

As the gentleman from New York said about the misnomer of suicide bomber, the phrase suicide bomber suggests one crazed person going off into a field and killing themselves with a bomb. We call what is happening in Israel the actions of suicide bombers, but in fact they are better named homicide bombers because they are not just taking out themselves, they are trying to kill as many innocent people as they possibly can.

That is the terror faced by Israel. That is what she has to defend herself against. And we can clearly state that Israel has the right to self-defense. It is not for us to set a limit on that right. It is up to us to support her in her activity, to make sure she survives; and she will survive with our support.

EDUCATION TAX CREDITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to talk about children and the topic of education. I believe it is the most important issue that we have to discuss, especially when we look out into the future of America and where we are headed.

My colleagues who preceded me had a very excellent discussion, the tenor of which I certainly concur with and agree. And I guess I would ask colleagues to consider this same debate or similar debates years and years from now, when the children of today are the leaders of tomorrow and are debating these important matters of international peace and security and all the topics that we deal with here in the Congress.

I would invite my colleagues who may be monitoring today's pro-

ceedings, if they are interested in engaging in this discussion or participating in it, to come join me here on the floor. The topic today is, again, education, and particularly with respect to the proposal of education tax credits. This is something that our President has mentioned frequently. This is a topic that has become well-known in several States that have preceded this Congress in exploring the topic of education tax credits, and it is an innovative idea and a way to try to get new dollars, additional dollars to children for the purposes of expanding and broadening their academic horizons.

I am one who believes here, Mr. Speaker, that if our children really are important, and I believe they are, that this Congress ought to be prepared to spend whatever it takes to give them the kind of quality education that they deserve here in America, an education that is second to none. Unfortunately, we do not have that today, yet we spend almost every dollar we can dream up here in Washington and take from the taxpayers in order to spend on education. We have spent considerable amounts of money on the Federal education system, and that is magnified even to a far greater degree when we consider the billions of dollars, in fact the trillions of dollars that have been poured into education around the 50 States and through local school districts.

At least at the Federal level, for the amount of money that we have spent, about \$125 billion over the last 10 years to be precise, we should have better results, and we should certainly expect those results to be far improved over and above the indications of today. Our President understands this, and that was the basis of the legislation he persuaded this Congress to pass last year. His first major legislative initiative was all about education, and this was the core of his campaign for office. He proposed doing for the country what he managed to accomplish in Texas, and that was to first take into account the huge numbers of dollars that have been spent on education and then start asking questions, like what do we get for the money.

The governor of Texas at the time, our current President, was led to establish a testing strategy for the State of Texas, and that testing strategy has been credited by many with raising the achievement levels of the poorest children in that State. The President touted as a candidate the successes of Texas throughout the country, and the American people seemed to agree with the President. He came to Washington and suggested we should do the same thing for the whole Nation, and the Congress, by a pretty overwhelming margin, agreed with him. Democrats and Republicans joined together to help the President pass what turned out to be a higher set of expectations for the Nation, a system of national testing.

I want to start there, because what the President actually proposed up front was not only a testing strategy, that was just a portion, and in fact a smaller portion of his proposal, but he also proposed greater flexibilities for the States, and the most important element, the core of the President's proposal, was school choice. Unfortunately, the school choice provisions were ripped out of the bill even before it came up for its first hearing here on the House side, and the flexibility provisions were removed too, by the time the bill got through over on the other side of the Capitol, and all the President was left with was this the smaller portion of the bill which dealt with testing mandates on States.

In order to get the institutions of the bureaucracy of education to go along with the President's idea, even one-third of his idea, we had to feed the beast a tremendous amount of cash. We had to give more money to the Department of Education and all of the institutions associated with it in order to get them to comply or to go along. But as I said, if our children are really important, and I believe they are, we should be able to be prepared to spend whatever it takes in order to improve their education opportunity, and we certainly did that in H.R. 1. We expanded the Department dramatically in exchange for the new accountability that goes along with it.

But we have not lost sight of the core element of the President's proposal, and that is the school choice element. Tax credits give us an opportunity to extend education choice to more and more Americans and their children, and do so without threatening the education bureaucracy in any way, without threatening all those institutions and lobbyists that have built themselves up around the rules and the red tape and the spending regiment of the education empire. It does so by bypassing all of that, and in fact we are going to continue to feed more money to the bureaucracy. That is really not in doubt. And I do not think anybody in the bureaucracy needs to be threatened in any way or believe that their jobs are somehow going to go away. On the contrary, we are going to give them more cash. That is already budgeted and that is going to happen.

But education tax credits allow and inspire new investments in education, and that is why they are so exciting and why I hope a lot of people are paying attention to the issue because it is a serious one. It is one that the President has given his word that he is going to help drive through this Congress. It is a topic that has arrived on the priority list of the agenda items for our leadership, our Committee on Education and the Workforce, and also members of some of the other committees, the Committee on Ways and Means in particular, which deals with tax policy, and a lot of people around the country are excited.

They are excited, Mr. Speaker, because they have managed to see how

tax credits work in a handful of States. There are six States, to be exact, that have tax credit legislation on their State law books and they are seeing the fruits of that. What I mean is they are realizing that by manipulating the Tax Code, taxpayers are eager to contribute money to the schools and to do so in a way that provides new kinds of education choices to children who have not had choice in the past.

Education choice is not such an important issue to those who are wealthy, because they can afford to buy it. They can afford to forego the property taxes, the income taxes, the sales taxes that they are paying right now, in generous proportions, I might add, to government-owned schools, and, instead, pay additional dollars for the tuition that it may cost to attend a private institution. So if you have money, school choice is really not something that is out of reach. By if you are poor in America, you do not have school choice, typically, except in a handful of places where these tax credits exist; or in some places where vouchers exist, which is something entirely different than what is being discussed tonight, still a good idea but different; and in places where private individuals have banded together to try to raise money to provide scholarships for low-income children.

That exists in almost every State, these student tuition organizations, as they are called. We call them in our legislation education investment organizations. They exist in all 50 States today, and they exist because of the generosity of many, many Americans who want to contribute their earnings and pay back to society in some way that offers real hope and opportunity for young children.

I have some letters from some of the children who have benefited from these investment organizations, these scholarship funds, and I will read from some of them. They are pretty inspiring and I think speak to why we need to be aggressive about achieving this legislation this year. But what we are really here to propose and to discuss is the legislation that is in the works right now that will be introduced within just a couple of weeks that will provide a change in the Tax Code to make it easier for Americans to contribute to these scholarship funds and to contribute directly to public schools for local priorities, for priorities that are established by local school board members or established by community leaders through the creation of these scholarship funds.

The tax credits work this way: for every dollar that you would contribute to a scholarship organization for poor children, or contribute to a public education facility, a local neighborhood school, you would receive a 50 percent tax credit from the Federal Government. So for every dollar you give to the school, you cut your tax bill in half for the equivalent contribution. And there is a cap on that. We cannot make

this unlimited, of course. We have to deal with some of the financial realities of the Congress. So this is a \$250 credit that will correspond to a \$500 donation.

I have a cousin in Colorado Springs who is a tax preparer, and just a couple of days ago she asked me about this proposal. And she asked, Will this benefit me? Will I be able to contribute to a school and get the credit, since my children are not in the school anymore? This is something that appeals to her, and she wanted to know if the credit would apply to her. And the answer is yes.

And I think the question itself is really what is so exciting about education tax credits, not only in this proposal but what we have seen by way of the record in several States, and that is parents and people in communities who are not even parents of children in the affected schools are eager and enthusiastic about contributing to an education model in which they fundamentally believe. The notion of school choice appeals to millions and millions of Americans. It does not appeal to all Americans, but it appeals to most Americans.

So for those who believe that it makes more sense to continue shoveling cash to the government, well that option is available. And in fact most Americans will be forced to do that whether they really want to or not, as we do today. But it provides a second option for those who want to try something different, who want to try to bypass that bureaucracy and get dollars directly to children.

So I am really enthusiastic about the proposal, and as more and more people learn about it and hear about it, they are joining up with the campaign that we have here in Congress to prepare the bill, to lobby our colleagues and persuade them that this is the right thing to do, that the experience in the States that have education tax credit legislation is an experience worth considering and something worth duplicating here in Washington.

I received a letter from somebody in Fort Collins, Colorado, they did not give me permission to use their name so I will not, but in the letter he says, one of my constituents says, "Education tax credits have the greatest potential to significantly and instantly affect change in our current educational system. As parents know best their children's strengths, needs and efficiencies, this tax credit would ensure that money spent would be used in the most beneficial and targeted way possible. With this legislation, parents would be empowered to ensure that their children are equipped with the academic and educational tools necessary to improve their quality of education. Also, as this tax credit is for all educational expenses, parental involvement in their child's education would be fostered and encouraged. This bill will ensure that economic considerations will never again keep lower-income children from receiving an all-

important supplemental education at home. The quality of our children's education stands to be greatly enriched by this legislation, just as millions of children across the United States would be affected as well."

Well, that is pretty compelling testimony, again from one of my constituents. And I may raise this with him at another time to see if I can use his name publicly. I do not have that permission now, as I mentioned. But this is the kind of letter that many of us are receiving here in Congress, and that is not the only one I have received in my office. Again, this debate is taking place in my home State, so people are in tune with it there.

□ 2245

As I mentioned, in some of the States that have passed tax credit legislations, and the best examples are Arizona, Pennsylvania, Florida, and Minnesota has passed a tax credit bill, too. What they are seeing in those States is really dramatic and remarkable. Here is some testimony that was delivered in front of one of the committees that took place in one of our States in terms of the impact that these scholarship funds are having. This is from a student named Sasha. She said again in prepared testimony, "My family applied for a scholarship for me to be able to study at the school that I consider a very special place."

Let me stop there. That really is the key because the definition of quality of education today under the bureaucratic model that we have established for the country falls into the hands of the bureaucrats who run the bureaucracy. Let us say you have a 5-year-old that is going to kindergarten, or maybe you have older kids and you move into a new neighborhood. You call the school district and say, Johnny is ready to go to school, what are my options?

The first question you will get is what is your address. When you deliver your address to the person on the other end of the phone, they will say your address corresponds to a particular neighborhood school. If they have a lot of money where the school is usually better, or if they move into a poorer neighborhood where unfortunately the records show and is amply demonstrated, usually means that the school is not a good one and not one you probably would choose if you had unlimited resources at your disposal.

With a tax credit, the goal is to move away from trusting somebody who does not know the name of your child with placing your child into a school that they think makes sense for this child that they do not know. Tax credits leave this decision to people who know the child better, the parents.

Sasha wrote, "My family applied for a scholarship for me to be able to study at the school I consider a very special place. It is special because it is where I learn the most and where I enjoy learning. It is a place where I can

dream, and have that feeling that I am going to be successful in my life, successful because of what I am learning right now. In the past, my mom tried to put me in Catholic schools, but she could not afford the tuition for very long. Now I am in my second year in the same school because of the scholarships she has secured for my sisters and me. I will be very happy if I can stay at my school and have the same good friends as long as possible. They are special, too."

Sasha goes on, "I think school is important because I have learned a lot of stuff that I did not know. I have just learned how to add, subtract, multiply and divide fractions. We will be doing geometry soon. I know I am learning all of this because algebra is coming. I think that might be fun. Going to Blessed Sacrament is important because the work is challenging, not easy. The most challenging subject is math because of the concept of algebra. At first math was easy, but now it is hard. I really try hard to get good grades." Sasha goes on and describes her experience in the school that she was able to choose as a result of her scholarship.

The reason tax credit legislation is relevant to this student is because manipulating the Tax Code to reduce the tax burden on Americans who contribute to such scholarship organizations will result in a massive cash infusion in America's education system, and it will result in the same kinds of positive experiences for more and more children across the country, just as the experience occurred to the student I just referred to.

Here is testimony from a teacher. This was given to the Colorado State legislature, testimony before that legislative body. This teacher's name is Maureen Lord. She is the supervisor for a group called Save Our Youth. She told the Colorado State legislature about a particular student named Joe Ray. "Joe Ray was designated learning disabled at the local public school. At the end of his fifth grade year, he was reading between a second and third grade level, hated writing anything. His distraction level was extremely high. To complicate things more, he had some fine motor problems. Being an elementary educator myself, I knew that Joe Ray would never be at grade level if he continued in the public school system where he only received an hour of special attention during each school day. His future looked dismal for accomplishing the basic skills he needed to go on to middle and high school."

Let me point out that this experience is not unique throughout the country, but it is also not the rule in most public schools. I would bet that if Joe Ray lived in a wealthy neighborhood, that Joe Ray would receive the kind of attention that he needed; but Joe Ray does not live in a wealthy neighborhood, he lives in a poorer neighborhood in Colorado. The only school that was

available to him was the one that the government said was available to him, and it was not a good fit.

The teacher, pleading on his behalf goes on, "One day on the radio, I heard about a private school that works with kids having problems similar to Joe Ray. Unbelievably, they were opening another branch in northwest Denver in the fall of 2000, and it would be located relatively close to where Joe Ray lived. After visiting the facility and meeting with the director, I knew this might be a fit for Joe Ray, but there were so many hurdles to overcome. One of the hurdles was the tuition. Joe Ray's family was in the lower socio-economic scale and anything short of a miracle was needed for him to be able to attend a private school. That is just what happened. Joe Ray applied for a scholarship, and received a 4-year partial scholarship to this private school. With the help from his mentor and his mentor's supervisor, the obstacles were falling one by one.

"Let me tell you more about the miracles. Joe Ray aced last semester's report card. His teacher says he is a wonderful young man to work with and eager learner. The multisensory math program is helping him to remember his times tables, and his confidence is growing. He now frequently looks you in the eye when he talks to you. This is just one young boy who is benefiting from the investment that scholarships made in his future. I hope this is of some encouragement to you. We at Save Our Youth are grateful."

Joe Ray also testified before the Colorado legislature. He said, "I am really glad I do not have to go to my old school anymore. There were always people selling drugs there. I was afraid to go to school because I didn't want to get beat up any more at my old school. They gave me the answers to the CSAP test," which is the State standardized test. That is pretty common. I hear that not only in Colorado but in several States.

"They were not very helpful to me with math, reading and writing. I did not like my old school at all. I like my new school because they help me better. They teach me in a way that is right for me. The teacher is nice to me, and there are so many other school kids. I also like that I do not have to switch classes. I like Dove Christian Academy so much I want to come back again. The new school I go to does help me a lot more. Dove Christian Academy does different things to help me learn. I read a lot better now, and I think my math and writing are better, too. I really thank ACE and the money they have given me. I am so glad I was able to come to the school and learn. Now I have a chance to get a good education and maybe even go to college. I never would have thought of that before if it weren't for ACE."

Pretty powerful testimony in one State that has an experience with education tax credits. We can do this for the whole country. We have a chance

to accomplish this in all 50 States and amplify the good record that is taking place in a handful of other States across the country.

This is a topic that is not one that belongs to Democrats or Republicans, conservatives or liberals. I happen to be a Republican, but this is a proposal that has been advanced by Democrats and State legislators around the country. It is supported by Democrats here. It is one that has been proposed in my State in the Colorado State senate, and a liberal one at that, and at the same time was being carried in the State House of Representatives by a very conservative Republican.

It has the ability to bring people together of different political persuasions because at its focus is America's school children. I have to confess when it comes to the education debate in Washington, too often children are the last individuals considered. We talk about them a lot, there is no doubt about that. We get nice pictures of them up here and try to suggest to the country and the world that the children are at the center of the debate, and I think they are in our hearts. We care about the kids, there is no doubt about that. But by the time the bills make it to the floor of this House and over to the other side of the Capitol, the lobbyists take over, and they watch every line item in these bills and make sure that their organizations and their members are not affected by the ideas that we advance to try to help children. The children are at a disadvantage because they do not have lobbyists here. Their parents vote for us as Congressmen and Senators, and sometimes Members get replaced when they do not fight hard enough. That does happen from time to time. The lobbyists watch much closer here. They fight hard to maintain and preserve the bureaucracy and the unions that go along with America's education system.

When you cross these powerful groups, the consequences are sometimes very, very dangerous because they have millions of dollars to spend against you. They have big political campaign war chests that they use to try to persuade people that if you do not persuade your constituents back home if you are not fighting hard enough for the bureaucracy, for the institution or the union, that that means you do not care about children and you should be replaced. They have a far more successful ratio of replacing Congressmen who do not stand up for the bureaucracy than the children do and their parents when children fail to be the objective of education debates.

Here is why this is true. This chart on my right explains how money gets down to a child. At the top is a hardworking taxpayer who pays his cash, a portion of his earnings through taxes. It is not voluntary; it is confiscated from his paycheck. Those dollars are confiscated by the Treasury Department. His employer is forced to send a portion of his paycheck to Washington,

D.C. to the Treasury Department. The Treasury Department takes account of all of these dollars, tracks how these dollars are coming in, so that politicians, me and my colleagues in Congress, we make decisions on how to spend these dollars. We spend a pretty sizable portion on the United States Department of Education. They occupy some large buildings. We allocate a big chunk to the Department, and it goes to those buildings two blocks away. Once it gets there, it is distributed and redistributed and transferred to States, all 50 States and territories and districts, the District of Columbia as well. At the State level the politicians there, the State legislators, they divvy up the dollars that come from the Federal Government as well as State and local dollars. They redistribute the funds to the State Department of Education and that whole bureaucracy.

□ 2300

The State Department of Education gives those dollars to the school districts in all 50 States. In Colorado there are 176 school districts. The school districts, of course, they are run by politicians, elected school board members, and they meet with all the interest groups that they have to deal with and they decide how to spend these dollars and apportion them for the various schools within a school district. Once the principals and the teachers and everybody at the school level have decided how to prioritize those funds, then these dollars finally get to the child way down here. By the time the taxpayer's dollar goes through this whole vortex of bureaucracy and politicians, the proportion of money that actually makes it to the child is very, very small. In fact, it has been estimated that somewhere around 30 to 40 percent of the tax dollar taken from the hardworking American for the purpose of education ever makes it down to the child.

That explains the politics of education in America, which has as much to do with the necessity of education tax credits as the positive outcome of tax credits themselves.

I have tried, as many of my colleagues have, Mr. Speaker, to try to change this system from within. I came here to Washington because I have got five kids of my own. I kind of feel that my children have kind of the dead hand of government laying over their shoulder as they try to progress in the public schools back home in Colorado. And so I wanted to come here and try to fix some of this nonsense. I spent 9 years as a State Senator trying to fix it from here down. We made some success, but this bureaucracy is large. Every one of these organizations has lobbyists and they have interest groups. The employees of the State Departments of Education and the U.S. Department of Education, they organize. The teachers in all of these districts, the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, these are two

teachers unions that are frankly the largest political influence in America and they are all a part of this process. So when we come to Washington and suggest changing and improving or amending in any way the flow of dollars through this process, you get a big political fight on your hands. It is a fight worth engaging, do not get me wrong. I enjoy doing it. It is the right fight. My kids matter enough that I am willing to take it on and suffer whatever political consequences might occur. But sometimes we win. Sometimes we lose. Usually we lose. Anybody who wants to change this system usually loses, because the relationship between these agencies matters more to politicians in Washington and politicians in the States and ultimately to school board members than the child does down here in the bottom. I hate to admit that, but that is absolutely the truth. I would defy anyone to try to deny that and would welcome a vigorous debate on that point.

Again, I am willing to admit we all talk about the kid down here, but when the debate takes place on the House floor it is all the people who run these agencies that count the most, unfortunately. They are the ones who are heard the loudest. Their voices tend to drown out the child down here at the bottom and they drown out the expectations of the taxpayer, too.

Rather than try to tamper with all this in a tax credit bill or an education proposal, keep in mind that trying to improve this system is an ongoing function of the Education Committee and we are working on that, but that really is a separate debate than the proposal that we are rallying around now. Because rather than amend this or change it or do anything to this, we are going to leave it alone and try to bypass this process with new money, not the old money. We are going to continue to feed cash to this system in America. It is already budgeted this year. Mark my words, when the appropriation bill passes, we are going to grow the size of this bureaucracy because it does not matter who is in charge, it does not matter whether Republicans are in charge or Democrats are in charge, we are going to grow the size of this bureaucracy. That is the track record. That is the way it is. We have got to accept that. I finally have. But I am trying to find a way to get this guy's dollar to that child and tax credits is a way to accomplish that.

Here is how the tax credit model works. The hardworking taxpayer donates directly to the needs of a child. Again, they do this through a change in the Tax Code, not a change in the education bureaucracy. Because the Tax Code allows this taxpayer to make a donation based on what strikes him or her as a good idea, a local priority, an urgent need, and to donate to that cause rather than continue to shovel cash through that other system I just described, the bureaucratic model that is Washington, D.C.'s education system. When explained to Americans

across the country, this is what Americans prefer. Taxpayers like this guy have expressed to me, just as my cousin did last week, that even though she does not have children who are in schools anymore, she would love to have the advantage of a tax credit so that she could contribute to the education cause in her neighborhood, for somebody else's child, for a poor child whose future will not be so bright unless we are willing to put the cash forward to provide a little freedom for the child, a little liberty that wealthy parents can afford. It is not just the individuals who can contribute. Our tax credit proposal also entails corporate contributions, because we have heard from businesses around the country as well that if given the chance they would prefer to invest in an academic program in their neighborhood that is designed by a school board member perhaps or maybe by a superintendent or maybe by a church or a synagogue or maybe by a nonprofit organization, they would rather invest in something they believe in locally than continue to send exorbitant amounts of money here and have it filtered through this process that I described.

And they like the idea that tax credits allows us to begin to measure the fairness in education by the relationship between individuals rather than the relationship between these political entities. And like it or not, that is how we measure education fairness in America today. Schools keep track of how much each school receives. School districts keep track of how much school districts receive. They compare themselves to each other. Every State has got a lobbyist in Washington, by the way. Not the elected officials. I mean, they hire lobbyists to come here. Every State has lobbyists back here. The lobbyist's job is to make sure that Colorado, in the example of my State, is receiving generally the same amounts of money that Kansas is or Wyoming or any of our neighboring States. You have got this 50 times over as these lobbyists are measuring education fairness by the relationship between their political jurisdiction in their States. And then, of course, up here at the Federal level, agencies and departments, they just do not like to lose money. If a program received a billion dollars last year, the people who run that program want to make sure they receive at least a billion dollars next year, too. And if they have fewer students that they serve, that does not matter. If they do not serve students well, that does not matter. They just want the same amount of money or more, because that is how they get the plaques on their wall suggesting that they are good bureaucrats, good managers. These people work hard, they care, they have been trained well to operate within the system. In fact they have got their own language. If you ever sit in the meetings that I get to sit in on, you will learn about this whole new language that exists in the

education bureaucracy. They have got all these agencies and programs that are called by their initials, these terms that relate to my kids that we do not use at home but if you want to be involved in discussions about this, you have got to learn another language that is kind of irrelevant and makes no sense to the taxpayer up here at the top or the child down there at the bottom. Once again, that is fine for all the people who work in this system, but fairness in education should not be measured by the relationship between programs or States or school districts or individual schools. Fairness should be measured by the relationship between children down here at the bottom. That is what the tax credit proposal really allows us to begin to do.

We get to start thinking about some of these students that are referred to in this testimony I read. We even had some of these students who came to Washington here and testified in front of the Education Committee. When you hear from the children who speak in terms of their future and their hope and learning about algebra and getting back to grade level and going to college, students who have been written off in the past, when you hear these kinds of stories, you begin to care about the kids again. You do not care so much about the comfort of the bureaucracy anymore. We will acknowledge that the bureaucracy is a big organization. They have got lots of lobbyists. They have got a lot of political firepower. We are going to leave them alone. We are going to find a new way to change the Tax Code and help children achieve their academic dreams.

□ 2310

This chart is one that refers to just one scholarship organization that exists today, and this is the kind of scholarship organization that a tax credit would utilize in order to reach children. It is a rather large one, it is called the Children's Scholarship Fund. I pulled this off of the Children's Scholarship Fund's website. This shows the concentration of applications that this scholarship organization received from throughout the country. The blue areas are places in America where children apply to receive scholarships from one nonprofit organization in order to attend schools that the children and their parents wanted their children to attend. This is broken down based on concentration of students. I will not go through the whole chart here, but the light blue is anywhere where you have from 1 to 99 applicants in a State; the red dots, these large cities, Detroit, Chicago, New Orleans, we can see Atlanta, New York, and so on, Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, these are places where anywhere between 10,000 and 80,000 people who are interested in scholarships might live. Now, these are where the applications came from, and there is a pretty broad level of interest from throughout the country.

Unfortunately, the Children's Scholarship Fund, again, a private organiza-

tion, not a government institution; it gives scholarships out based on how many people want to contribute to the scholarship fund out of their own free will as a donation; they do not have unlimited resources. They cannot give scholarships to all of these kids who want academic freedom, who want a little liberty in their lives, who want to be treated as well as wealthy children are who can choose the kind of school they want to attend. So all of these applicants applied, but only a fraction of them actually walked away with a scholarship and ended up with some of the success stories that I read about a little earlier.

The second chart shows us the distribution of recipients, and it is broken down by counties. We can see that the scholarship fund, this particular organization, the Children's Scholarship Fund does a great job. They reach thousands of children around America, but there is a lot that are just overlooked by this one organization.

What a tax credit will allow is for every taxpayer in America to contribute to an organization like the Children's Scholarship Fund. This would be one of their options. As I say, this is a large one that has kind of a national emphasis, but every one of our States, Mr. Speaker, has an organization similar to this one in it, at least one. The State of Arizona has about 70 of them.

The reason Arizona, if I can use Arizona as an example, the reason Arizona has so many scholarship organizations in it is because Arizona as a State passed education tax credit legislation 3 years ago. As time goes on, more and more people are deciding to send their State tax dollars to these scholarship organizations to help children. The impact that it is having on Arizona's children, especially the poor, is rather remarkable. In fact, it has been studied pretty extensively.

I just happen to have the analysis of the Arizona tax credit plan, the Arizona scholarship plan. This is a report that was written by 2 researchers, Carrie Lips and Jennifer Jacoby. In fact, Carrie Lips now works here for the House of Representatives and the Republican Policy Committee. What this report shows is really remarkable. It shows that between 1998 and 2000, the tax credit in Arizona generated 32 million new dollars and funded almost 19,000 scholarships through more than 30 scholarship organizations. Now, that is \$32 million in the education system of Arizona that was not there before. It is \$32 million that did not come from Arizona's public education system, but new dollars that came out of the pockets of Arizonans on a voluntary basis, because the Tax Code in Arizona makes it easier for people to invest in the number 1, most important industry in America, which is education. They believe that in Arizona. Mr. Speaker, 19,000 scholarships in just 3 years. People care about this. They have made a huge difference in the lives of students there.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Vern Ehlers	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/22	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Hon. John Mica	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Hon. Marion Berry	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Lloyd Jones	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Elizabeth Megginson	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Christine Kennedy	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Jimmy Miller	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Collin Chapman	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
William Sharrow	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Glen Scammel	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Susan Bodine	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Trinita Brown	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Art Chan	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Frank Mulvey	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Hon. John Mica	1/15	1/18	United Kingdom		1,032.00		809.00				1,841.00
	1/18	1/19	Belgium		257.00		211.00				468.00
	1/19	1/21	Germany		324.00						324.00
	1/21	1/22	Netherlands		220.00						220.00
Commercial airfare							3,718.00				3,718.00
Hon. Peter DeFazio	1/14	1/18	United Kingdom		1,376.00		402.00				1,778.00
Commercial airfare							4,615.00				4,615.00
Adam Tsao	1/18	1/19	Belgium		257.00		211.00				468.00
	1/19	1/21	Germany		324.00						324.00
	1/21	1/22	Netherlands		220.00						220.00
Commercial airfare							4,517.00				4,517.00
Elizabeth Megginson	1/15	1/22	United Kingdom		688.00						688.00
Commercial airfare							3,623.00				3,623.00
David Schaffer	1/15	1/18	United Kingdom		1,032.00		402.00				1,434.00
Commercial airfare							4,723.00				4,723.00
Stacie Soumbeniotis	1/15	1/18	United Kingdom		1,032.00		809.00				1,841.00
	1/18	1/19	Belgium		514.00						514.00
Commercial airfare							4,794.00				4,794.00
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	1/13	1/16	South Africa		564.00						564.00
	1/16	1/20	Namibia		476.00						476.00
Committee total					37,998.00		25,376.00				63,374.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Round trip D.C. to Europe.
⁴ Round trip Eugene, OR to Europe.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, May 1, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Larry Combust	1/11	1/12	Brazil		208.00		(3)		119.00		327.00
	1/12	1/15	Chile		888.00		(3)				888.00
	1/15	1/17	Brazil		470.00		(3)		240.00		710.00
	1/17	1/19	Colombia		542.00		(3)				542.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	1/11	1/12	Brazil		208.00		(3)		119.00		327.00
	1/12	1/15	Chile		888.00		(3)				888.00
	1/15	1/17	Brazil		470.00		(3)		240.00		710.00
	1/17	1/19	Colombia		542.00		(3)				542.00
Hon. Tom Osborne	1/11	1/12	Brazil		208.00		(3)		119.00		327.00
	1/12	1/15	Chile		888.00		(3)				888.00
	1/15	1/17	Brazil		470.00		(3)		240.00		710.00
	1/17	1/19	Colombia		542.00		(3)				542.00
Hon. Ernie Fletcher	1/11	1/12	Brazil		208.00		(3)		119.00		327.00
	1/12	1/15	Chile		888.00		(3)				888.00
	1/15	1/17	Brazil		470.00		(3)		240.00		710.00
	1/17	1/19	Colombia		542.00		(3)				542.00
Lynn Gallagher	1/11	1/12	Brazil		208.00		(3)		119.00		327.00
	1/12	1/15	Chile		888.00		(3)				888.00
	1/15	1/17	Brazil		470.00		(3)		240.00		710.00
	1/17	1/19	Colombia		542.00		(3)				542.00
Alan Mackey	1/11	1/12	Brazil		208.00		(3)		119.00		327.00
	1/12	1/15	Chile		888.00		(3)				888.00
	1/15	1/17	Brazil		470.00		(3)		240.00		710.00
	1/17	1/19	Colombia		542.00		(3)				542.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Jason Vaillancourt	1/11	1/12	Brazil		208.00		(³)		119.00		327.00
	1/12	1/15	Chile		888.00		(³)				888.00
	1/15	1/17	Brazil		470.00		(³)		240.00		710.00
Tom Sell	1/17	1/19	Colombia		542.00		(³)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Brazil		208.00		(³)		119.00		327.00
	1/12	1/15	Chile		888.00		(³)				888.00
	1/15	1/17	Brazil		470.00		(³)				710.00
	1/17	1/19	Colombia		542.00		(³)		240.00		542.00
Stephen Haterius	1/11	1/12	Brazil		208.00		(³)				327.00
	1/12	1/15	Chile		888.00		(³)		119.00		888.00
	1/15	1/17	Brazil		470.00		(³)				710.00
	1/17	1/19	Colombia		542.00		(³)		240.00		542.00
Hon. Charles Pickering	2/3	2/5	South Korea		436.00			7,195.00			7,631.00
Hon. Bob Schaffer	2/22	2/23	Germany		212.00						212.00
Hon. Eva Clayton	2/23	2/26	Italy		968.00			6,262.00			7,230.00
Committee total					20,588.00			13,457.00		3,231.00	37,276.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

LARRY COMBEST, Chairman, Apr. 10, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Frank M. Cushing	1/8	1/9	New Zealand		100.00						100.00
	1/10	1/15	Antarctica		500.00						500.00
	1/15	1/17	Australia		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							7,884.55				7,884.55
Dena Baron	1/8	1/9	New Zealand		100.00						100.00
	1/10	1/15	Antarctica		500.00						500.00
	1/15	1/17	Australia		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							7,884.55				7,884.55
Jennifer Miller	1/8	1/9	New Zealand		100.00						100.00
	1/10	1/15	Antarctica		500.00						500.00
	1/15	1/17	Australia		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							7,884.55				7,884.55
Dale Oak	1/8	1/9	New Zealand		100.00						100.00
	1/10	1/15	Australia		500.00						500.00
	1/15	1/17	Australia		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							7,884.55				7,884.55
Joel Kaplan	1/8	1/9	New Zealand		100.00						100.00
	1/10	1/15	Antarctica		500.00						500.00
	1/15	1/17	Australia		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							7,884.55				7,884.55
Hon. Joe Knollenberg	1/8	1/11	Germany		948.00						948.00
	1/11	1/13	Belgium								
	1/11	1/13	France		1,047.00						1,047.00
	1/14	1/17	England		1,576.00		(³)				1,576.00
Hon. Chaka Fattah	1/8	1/11	Germany		948.00						948.00
	1/11	1/11	Belgium								
	1/11	1/12	France		1,047.00						1,047.00
Part commercial airfare							416.40				416.40
Americo S. Miconi	1/8	1/11	Germany		948.00		(³)				948.00
	1/11	1/11	Belgium								
	1/11	1/13	France		1,047.00						1,047.00
Part commercial airfare							1,576.00				1,576.00
	1/14	1/17	England		1,576.00						1,576.00
							2,768.83				2,768.83
							136.60				136.60
Hon. Bud Cramer	⁴ 12/29	⁴ 12/31	Belgium		514.00		(³)				514.00
	⁴ 12/31	1/3	Germany		798.00						798.00
	1/3	1/5	Czech. Republic		606.00						606.00
	1/5	1/7	Hungary		568.00						568.00
	1/7	1/9	Austria		392.00						392.00
	1/9	1/13	United Kingdom		1,376.00						1,376.00
Hon. Todd Tiahrt	⁴ 12/30	1/2	Philippines		582.00		(³)				582.00
	1/02	1/03	USA		194.00						194.00
Commercial airfare							4,539.60				4,539.60
							200.00				200.00
Hon. Jim Kolbe	1/12	1/13	Uzbekistan		260.00						260.00
	1/13	1/14	Tajikistan		254.00						254.00
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		870.00						870.00
	1/17	1/19	Italy		516.00						516.00
Hon. Jack Kingston	1/12	1/13	Uzbekistan		320.00		(³)				320.00
	1/13	1/17	Pakistan		860.00						860.00
	1/17	1/19	Italy		720.00		(³)				720.00
Hon. John E. Sununu	1/12	1/13	Uzbekistan		320.00		(³)				320.00
	1/13	1/17	Pakistan		860.00						860.00
	1/17	1/19	Italy		720.00		(³)				720.00
Hon. Maurice D. Hinchey	1/12	1/13	Uzbekistan		320.00		(³)				320.00
	1/13	1/17	Pakistan		860.00						860.00
	1/17	1/19	Italy		720.00		(³)				720.00
Hon. Roger Wicker	1/12	1/13	Uzbekistan		320.00		(³)				320.00
	1/13	1/17	Pakistan		860.00						860.00
	1/17	1/19	Italy		720.00		(³)				720.00
Charles Flickner	1/12	1/13	Uzbekistan		260.00						260.00
	1/13	1/14	Tajikistan		254.00						254.00
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		870.00						870.00
	1/17	1/19	Italy		516.00		(³)				516.00
Alice E.H. Grant	1/10	⁴ 1/13	Uzbekistan		1,000.00						1,000.00
	1/13	1/17	Pakistan		860.00						860.00
	1/18	1/19	Italy		360.00		(³)				360.00
Mark Murray	1/10	⁴ 1/13	Uzbekistan		1,000.00						1,000.00
	1/13	1/17	Pakistan		860.00						860.00
	1/18	1/19	Italy		360.00		(³)				360.00
Michael Stephens	1/20	1/24	France		1,196.00						1,196.00
	1/24	1/27	England		1,032.00						1,032.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Greg Walden	1/25	1/25	Guantanamo Bay Cuba								
Hon. Peter Deutsch	1/6	1/11	Israel		1,248.00		4,433.75				5,681.75
Hon. Charlie Norwood	1/11	1/12	Brazil		208.00						208.00
	1/12	1/15	Chile		888.00						888.00
	1/15	1/17	Brazil		470.00						470.00
	1/17	1/19	Colombia		542.00						542.00
Hon. Nathan Deal	1/9	1/10	Nicaragua		201.00						201.00
	1/10	1/13	Colombia		331.00						331.00
	1/13	1/16	Paraguay		711.00						711.00
	1/16	1/18	Ecuador/Curacao								
Hon. George Radanovich	2/18	2/18	Canada				774.20				774.20
Damon Nelson, Radanovich Staff	2/18	2/18	Canada				777.47				777.47
Committee total					4,599.00		5,985.42				10,584.42

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILLY TAUZIN, Chairman, Apr. 23, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Barney Frank	1/6	1/13	Israel		2,684.00		3,333.70				6,017.70
Hon. Mark Green	1/13	1/16	South Africa		564.00						564.00
	1/15	1/15	Lesotho								
	1/16	1/20	Namibia		476.00		8,116.51				8,592.51
Hon. Vito Fossella	1/25	1/25	Cuba				(³)				
Hon. Bernard Sanders	2/15	2/16	Netherlands		198.00		(³)				198.00
	2/16	2/16	Belarus				(³)				
	2/16	2/21	Russia		1,720.00		(³)				1,720.00
	2/21	2/23	Germany		398.00		(³)				398.00
Hon. Michael Oxley	3/22	3/23	Belgium		257.00		(³)				257.00
	3/23	3/26	England		1,032.00		(³)				1,032.00
	3/26	3/29	Germany		852.00		(³)				852.00
Hon. Melvin Watt	3/22	3/23	Belgium		257.00		(³)				257.00
	3/23	3/26	England		1,032.00		(³)				1,032.00
	3/26	3/29	Germany		852.00		(³)				852.00
Terry Haines	3/22	3/23	Belgium		257.00		(³)				257.00
	2/23	3/26	England		1,032.00		(³)				1,032.00
	3/26	3/29	Germany		852.00		(³)				852.00
James K. Conzelman	3/22	3/23	Belgium		257.00		(³)				257.00
	3/23	3/26	England		1,032.00		(³)				1,032.00
	3/26	3/29	Germany		852.00		(³)				852.00
Robert Gordon	3/22	3/23	Belgium		257.00		(³)				257.00
	3/23	3/26	England		1,032.00		(³)				1,032.00
	3/26	3/29	Germany		852.00		(³)				852.00
Paul Kangas	3/22	3/23	Belgium		257.00		(³)				257.00
	3/23	3/26	England		1,032.00		(³)				1,032.00
	3/26	3/29	Germany		852.00		(³)				852.00
Carter K. McDowell	3/22	3/23	Belgium		257.00		(³)				257.00
	3/23	3/26	England		1,032.00		(³)				1,032.00
	3/26	3/29	Germany		852.00		(³)				852.00
Patricia A. Lord	3/22	3/23	Belgium		257.00		(³)				257.00
	3/23	3/26	England		1,032.00		(³)				1,032.00
	3/26	3/29	Germany		852.00		(³)				852.00
Hon. John LaFalce	3/22	3/23	Belgium		257.00		(³)				257.00
	3/23	3/26	England		1,032.00		863.60				1,895.60
Committee total					24,457.00		12,313.81				36,770.81

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Gilbert Macklin	1/14	1/18	Colombia		984.00		1,994.00				2,978.00
Marc Chretien	1/14	1/18	Colombia		984.00		1,994.00				2,978.00
Kevin Long	1/3	1/5	Venezuela		757.00		2,369.00				3,126.00
	1/5	1/10	Colombia		1,293.50						1,293.50
Christopher Donesa	1/6	1/10	Colombia		920.50		3,000.00				3,920.50
Hon. Christopher Shays	1/7	1/8	Turkey		468.00		5,941.00				6,409.00
	1/8	1/10	Israel		894.00				237.25		1,131.25
Lawrence Halloran	1/7	1/8	Turkey		468.00		5,933.71				6,401.71
	1/8	1/10	Israel		894.00				237.25		1,131.25
Nicholas Palarino	1/7	1/8	Turkey		468.00		5,933.71				6,401.71
	1/8	1/10	Israel		894.00				237.25		1,131.25
Dave Rapallo	1/7	1/8	Turkey		468.00		5,933.71				6,401.71
	1/8	1/10	Israel		894.00				237.25		1,131.25
Thomas Costa	1/20	1/26	Bolivia		1,023.00		2,988.00				4,011.00
Dave Rapallo	1/20	1/26	Bolivia		1,023.00		2,988.00				4,011.00
Hon. Ron Lewis	2/16	2/21	Russia		1,720.00						1,720.00
	2/21	2/23	Germany		398.00						398.00
	2/23	2/25	Netherlands		198.00						198.00
Hon. Todd Russell Platts	2/23	2/25	Germany		424.00		1,025.98				1,449.98
Hon. Sharon Pinkerton	1/16	1/18	England		688.00		4,973.00				5,661.00
	1/18	1/19	Belgium		257.00						257.00
	1/19	1/21	Germany		324.00						324.00
	1/21	1/22	The Netherlands		220.00						220.00
Committee total					16,662.00		45,074.11		949.00		62,685.11

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAN BURTON, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
David Abramowitz	1/13	1/16	Korea		614.00						614.00
	1/16	1/17	Hong Kong		280.00						280.00
	1/17	1/21	Vietnam		491.00						491.00
Round trip commercial airfare									6,233.91		6,233.91
Hon. Gary Ackerman	1/5	1/6	Jordan		235.00						235.00
	1/5	1/11	Israel		1,598.00						1,598.00
									5,835.95		5,835.95
David Adams	1/5	1/6	Jordan		235.00						235.00
	1/5	1/11	Israel		1,598.00						1,598.00
Round trip commercial airfare									6,841.15		6,841.15
	2/15	2/20	India		1,300.00						1,300.00
	2/21	2/24	Pakistan		636.00						636.00
	2/24	2/25	United Kingdom		294.00						294.00
Round trip commercial airfare									7,330.17		7,330.17
Douglas Anderson	1/13	1/16	Korea		872.00						872.00
	1/16	1/17	Hong Kong		349.00						349.00
	1/17	1/21	Vietnam		423.90						423.90
Round trip commercial airfare									5,766.26		5,766.26
Hon. Cass Ballenger	1/9	1/10	Nicaragua		96.00				(³)		96.00
	1/10	1/13	Colombia		623.00				(³)		623.00
	1/13	1/16	Paraguay		411.00				(³)		411.00
	1/16	1/18	Ecuador		94.00				(³)		94.00
Jessica Baumgarten	1/9	1/10	Nicaragua		201.00				(³)		201.00
	1/10	1/13	Colombia		543.00				(³)		543.00
	1/13	1/16	Paraguay		467.00				(³)		467.00
	1/16	1/18	Ecuador		94.00				(³)		94.00
Hon. Howard Berman	1/16	1/17	El Salvador		213.00						213.00
Round trip commercial airfare									2,427.50		2,427.50
Patrick T. Brennan	1/14	1/16	Paraguay		240.00						240.00
Commercial airfare									2,036.30		2,036.30
Malik Chaka	1/16	1/18	Ecuador		52.00				(³)		52.00
	1/6	1/11	South Africa		422.00						422.00
	1/11	1/14	Mozambique		558.00						558.00
	1/14	1/17	Kenya		606.00						606.00
	1/17	1/19	Uganda		514.00						514.00
Round trip commercial airfare									8,011.88		8,011.88
Hon. Eliot Engel	1/4	1/8	Israel		1,448.00						1,448.00
Round trip commercial airfare									4,398.20		4,398.20
Hon. Jeff Flake	1/13	1/16	South Africa		564.00						564.00
	1/16	1/19	Namibia		356.00						356.00
Round trip commercial airfare									6,763.58		6,763.58
Paul Gallis	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00				(³)		771.00
	2/10	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Commercial airfare									2,866.16		2,866.16
Kirsti Garlock	1/9	1/10	Nicaragua		151.00				(³)		151.00
	1/10	1/13	Colombia		613.00				(³)		613.00
	1/13	1/16	Paraguay		367.00				(³)		367.00
	1/16	1/18	Ecuador		50.00				(³)		50.00
Kristin Gilley	2/15	2/20	India		1,100.00						1,100.00
	2/21	2/24	Pakistan		586.00						586.00
	2/24	2/25	United Kingdom		244.00						244.00
Round trip commercial airfare									7,330.17		7,330.17
Charisse Glassman	1/13	1/16	South Africa		564.00						564.00
	1/16	1/18	Namibia		238.00						238.00
Round trip commercial airfare									8,116.51		8,116.51
Matthew Cobush	1/8	1/12	China		1,180.00						1,180.00
	1/12	1/15	Hong Kong		1,233.00						1,233.00
	1/15	1/18	Japan		990.00						990.00
Round trip commercial airfare									6,269.25		6,269.25
Dennis Halpin	1/7	1/12	China		1,316.00						1,316.00
	1/12	1/15	Hong Kong		1,233.00						1,233.00
	1/15	1/18	Japan		990.00						990.00
Round trip commercial airfare									7,037.67		7,037.67
Hon. Earl Hilliard	1/3	1/6	Korea		804.00						804.00
	1/6	1/7	Japan		278.00						278.00
Round trip commercial airfare									5,871.41		5,871.41
Alyssa Jorgenson	1/13	1/16	South Africa		564.00						564.00
	1/16	1/20	Namibia		476.00						476.00
Round trip commercial airfare									8,116.51		8,116.51
Trish Katyoka	1/6	1/11	South Africa		422.00						422.00
	1/11	1/14	Mozambique		558.00						558.00
	1/14	1/17	Kenya		606.00						606.00
	1/17	1/19	Uganda		514.00						514.00
Round trip commercial airfare									8,011.86		8,011.86
Kenneth Katzman	1/5	1/6	Jordan		235.00						235.00
	1/5	1/11	Israel		1,598.00						1,598.00
Round trip commercial airfare									6,841.45		6,841.45
David Killion	1/16	1/22	Switzerland		1,554.00						1,554.00
Round trip commercial airfare									5,538.01		5,538.01
Hon. Tom Lantos	1/7	1/12	China		1,456.00						1,456.00
	1/12	1/15	Hong Kong		1,233.00						1,233.00
	1/15	1/18	Japan		963.00						963.00
Round trip commercial airfare									5,815.17		5,815.17
John Mackey	1/9	1/10	Nicaragua		201.00				(³)		201.00
	1/10	1/13	Colombia		663.00				(³)		663.00
	1/13	1/16	Paraguay		567.00				(³)		567.00
	1/16	1/18	Ecuador		94.00				(³)		94.00
	2/18	2/21	United Kingdom		882.00						882.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002.—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Round trip commercial airfare	2/21	2/23	Austria		292.00						292.00
Pearl Alice Marsh	1/6	1/11	South Africa		422.00		7,203.67				7,203.67
	1/11	1/14	Mozambique		558.00						422.00
	1/14	1/17	Kenya		606.00						558.00
	1/17	1/19	Uganda		514.00						606.00
Round trip commercial airfare											514.00
Caleb McCary	1/9	1/10	Nicaragua		181.00		(³)				181.00
	1/10	1/13	Colombia		513.00		(³)				513.00
	1/13	1/16	Paraguay		464.00		(³)				464.00
	1/16	1/18	Ecuador		00.00		(³)				00.00
	2/17	2/20	Haiti		308.00						308.00
Hon. Cynthia McKinney	2/23	2/26	Italy		968.00		671.50				968.00
Round trip commercial airfare							5,628.22				5,628.22
Joan O'Donnell	1/6	1/11	South Africa		422.00						422.00
	1/11	1/14	Mozambique		558.00						558.00
	1/14	1/17	Kenya		606.00						606.00
	1/17	1/19	Uganda		514.00						514.00
Round trip commercial airfare							8,011.86				8,011.86
Paul Oostburg-Sanz	1/9	1/10	Nicaragua		162.30		(³)				162.30
	1/10	1/13	Colombia		176.70		(³)				176.70
	1/13	1/16	Paraguay		450.90		(³)				450.90
	1/16	1/18	Ecuador		16.60		(³)				16.60
	2/17	2/20	Haiti		223.00						223.00
Round trip commercial airfare							671.50				671.50
Stephen Rademaker	2/19	2/20	Austria		146.00						146.00
	2/20	2/21	Belgium		207.00						207.00
	2/21	2/23	United Kingdom		588.00						588.00
Round trip commercial airfare							6,825.33				6,825.33
	2/20	2/21	Belgium		207.00						207.00
	2/21	2/23	United Kingdom		588.00						588.00
Round trip commercial airfare							6,825.33				6,825.33
Francis Record	2/18	2/21	France		1,210.00						1,210.00
Round trip commercial airfare							5,926.00				5,926.00
Grover Joseph Rees	4/12/30	1/2	Philippines		607.11						607.11
Round trip commercial airfare							4,718.50				4,718.50
	3/21	3/25	Peru		790.00						790.00
Round trip commercial airfare							5,387.00				5,387.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	1/7	1/11	Israel		1,598.00						1,598.00
Round trip commercial airfare							3,306.00				3,306.00
Hon. Ed Royce	1/13	1/16	South Africa		564.00						564.00
	1/16	1/20	Namibia		476.00						476.00
Round trip commercial airfare							8,116.51				8,116.51
Thomas Sheehy	1/13	1/16	South Africa		564.00						564.00
	1/16	1/20	Namibia		476.00						476.00
Round trip commercial airfare							8,116.51				8,116.51
Hon. Christopher Smith	3/21	3/23	Peru		420.00						420.00
Round trip commercial airfare							5,521.50				5,521.50
Samuel Stratman	2/16	2/20	India		965.00						965.00
	2/21	2/24	Pakistan		586.00						586.00
	2/24	2/25	United Kingdom		294.00						294.00
Round trip commercial airfare							9,746.22				9,746.22
Valerie Van Buren	2/18	2/21	United Kingdom		882.00						882.00
	2/21	2/23	Austria		292.00						292.00
Round trip commercial airfare							7,203.67				7,203.67
Hillel Weinberg	2/18	2/20	India		470.00						470.00
	2/21	2/24	Pakistan		561.00						561.00
	2/24	2/25	United Kingdom		294.00						294.00
Round trip commercial airfare							7,834.34				7,834.34
Peter Yeo	1/7	1/12	China		1,456.00						1,456.00
	1/12	1/15	Hong Kong		1,233.00						1,233.00
	1/15	1/17	Japan		660.00						660.00
Round trip commercial airfare							6,773.17				6,773.17
Committee total					72,049.52		238,419.75				310,469.27

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.
⁴ Reflects fiscal year 2001.

HENRY J. HYDE, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Anthony M. Babauta	1/5	1/12	Republic of Palau		1,900.00		5,959.55				7,859.55
Committee total					1,900.00		5,959.55				7,859.55

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES V. HANSEN, Chairman, Apr. 22, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	2/23/	2/26	Italy		968.00						968.00
Commercial airfare							6,221.72				6,221.72
Committee total					968.00		6,221.72				7,189.72

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT, Chairman, Apr. 23, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOEL HEFLEY, Chairman, Apr. 23, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Don Young	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama	642.00	642.00						642.00
Hon. Wayne Gilchrest	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Hon. Collin Peterson	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Hon. Vern Ehlers	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Hon. John Mica	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Hon. Marion Berry	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Lloyd Jones	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Elizabeth Megginson	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Christine Kennedy	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Jimmy Miller	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Collin Chapman	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
William Sharrow	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Glen Scammel	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Susan Bodine	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Trinita Brown	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Art Chan	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Frank Mulvey	2/14	2/17	Uruguay		512.00						512.00
	2/17	2/19	Chile		592.00						592.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		642.00						642.00
Committee total					29,682						29,682

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jim Gibbons	1/7	1/15	Central/South America		2,022.50						2,022.50
Commercial airfare							4,597.49				4,597.49
Christopher Barton	1/7	1/15	Central/South America		2,022.50						2,022.50
Commercial airfare							4,286.67				4,286.67
Brant Bassett	1/7	1/15	Central/South America		2,022.50						2,022.50
Commercial airfare							4,286.67				4,286.67
Michele Lang	1/7	1/15	Central/South America		2,022.50						2,022.50
Commercial airfare							4,286.67				4,286.67
John Stopher	1/8	1/22	Asia		3,177.00						3,177.00
Commercial airfare							4,998.60				4,998.60
Hon. Douglas Bereuter	1/8	1/10	Asia								
Commercial airfare							1,866.79				1,866.79
Hon. Collin Peterson	1/9	1/18	Central/South America		1,525.00		(3)				1,525.00
Hon. Saxby Chambliss	1/9	1/16	Middle East		2,020.00		(3)		646.10		2,666.10
Hon. Jane Harman	1/9	1/16	Middle East		2,020.00		(3)		646.10		2,666.10

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	1/9	1/16	Middle East		2,020.00		(³)		646.10		2,666.10
Hon. Richard Burr	1/9	1/16	Middle East		2,020.00		(³)		646.10		2,666.10
James Lewis	1/9	1/16	Middle East		2,020.00		(³)		646.10		2,666.10
Wyndee Parker	1/9	1/16	Middle East		2,020.00		(³)		646.10		2,666.10
Merrell Moorhead	1/23	1/26	Europe		1,032.00						1,032.00
Commercial airfare								6,247.67			6,247.67
Jay Jakob	1/23	1/26	Europe		1,032.00						1,032.00
Commercial airfare								5,115.17			5,115.17
Michael Ennis	1/23	1/26	Europe		1,032.00						1,032.00
Commercial airfare								5,115.17			5,115.17
Hon. Collin Peterson	2/15	2/22	Central/South America		1,745.00		(³)				1,745.00
Hon. James Gibbons	2/17	2/24	Asia		1,381.00				36.34		1,417.34
Commercial airfare								6,720.93			6,720.93
Michele Lang	2/17	2/24	Asia		1,381.00				36.34		1,417.34
Commercial airfare								4,631.11			4,631.11
Brant Bassett	2/17	2/24	Asia		1,381.00				36.34		1,417.34
Commercial airfare								6,720.93			6,720.93
Christopher Barton	2/17	2/24	Asia		1,381.00				36.34		1,417.34
Commercial airfare								6,852.19			6,852.19
Michael Meermans	2/17	2/24	Asia		1,381.00				36.34		1,417.34
Commercial airfare								6,720.93			6,720.93
Elizabeth Larson	2/19	2/24	Europe		1,308.00						1,308.00
Commercial airfare								6,834.46			6,834.46
Jay Jakob	2/19	2/23	Europe		1,032.00						1,032.00
Commercial airfare								5,116.32			5,116.32
Committee total					38,999.00			84,397.77	4,058.30		127,455.07

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

PORTER J. GOSS, Chairman, Apr. 23, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES
 Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRIS SMITH, Apr. 30, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO JAPAN, THAILAND, AND KOREA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 8 AND JAN. 20, 2002.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	1/8	1/13	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	1/8	1/13	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
Hon. Roy Blunt	1/8	1/13	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
Hon. Kay Granger	1/8	1/13	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
Doug Bereuter	1/8	1/10	Japan	Y86,645	660.00						660.00
Bill Livingood	1/8	1/13	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
Scott Palmer	1/8	1/13	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
John Feehery	1/8	1/3	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
Sam Lancaster	1/8	1/13	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
Chris Walker	1/8	1/13	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
Susan Hirschmann	1/8	1/13	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
Shant Ochs	1/8	1/3	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
Dr. Eisdold	1/8	1/13	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
Steve Rusnak	1/8	1/13	Japan	Y204,534	1,558.00		(³)				1,558.00
Mike Stokke	1/8	1/12	Japan	Y167,513	1,276.00						1,276.00
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
Hon. Roy Blunt	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
Hon. Kay Granger	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
Bill Livingood	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
Scott Palmer	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
John Feehery	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
Sam Lancaster	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
Chris Walker	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
Susan Hirschmann	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
Shant Ochs	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
Dr. Eisdold	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
Steve Rusnak	1/13	1/17	Thailand	B40,832	928.00		(³)				928.00
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	1/17	1/20	Korea	W1,050,020	804.00		(³)				804.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	1/17	1/20	Korea	W1,050,020	804.00		(³)				804.00
Hon. Roy Blunt	1/17	1/20	Korea	W1,050,020	804.00		(³)				804.00
Hon. Kay Granger	1/17	1/20	Korea	W1,050,020	804.00		(³)				804.00
Bill Livingood	1/17	1/20	Korea	W1,050,020	804.00		(³)				804.00
John Feehery	1/17	1/20	Korea	W1,050,020	804.00		(³)				804.00
Sam Lancaster	1/17	1/20	Korea	W1,050,020	804.00		(³)				804.00
Chris Walker	1/17	1/20	Korea	W1,050,020	804.00		(³)				804.00
Susan Hirschmann	1/17	1/20	Korea	W1,050,020	804.00		(³)				804.00
Shant Ochs	1/17	1/20	Korea	W1,050,020	804.00		(³)				804.00
Dr. Eisdold	1/17	1/20	Korea	W1,050,020	804.00		(³)				804.00
Steve Rusnak	1/17	1/20	Korea	W1,050,020	804.00		(³)				804.00
Committee total					44,706.00						44,706.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Feb. 18, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO BELGIUM AND FRANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 16 AND FEB. 21, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Doug Bereuter	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Hon. Michael Bilirakis	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Hon. Paul Gillmor	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Hon. Porter Goss	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Hon. Joel Hefley	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Hon. Steve Horn	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Hon. Nicholas Lampson	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Hon. Scott McInnis	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Hon. Dennis Moore	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Hon. John Tanner	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Hon. Tom Udall	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Michael Ennis	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Robin Evans	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Charles Johnson	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Kay King	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Carol Lawrence	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Merrill Moorehead	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Patrick Prisco	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Susan Olson	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Josephine Weber	2/16	2/19	Belgium		771.00		(³)				771.00
	2/19	2/21	France		700.00						700.00
Committee total					29,420.00		5,732.32				35,152.32

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

DOUG BEREUTER, Chairman, Mar. 19, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. WILLIAM JEFF KAHRIS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 29, 2001 AND JAN. 4, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Jeff Kahrs, William	12/30	1/2	Philippines		582.00		4,528.70				5,110.70
							150.00				150.00
	1/2	1/3	USA		194.00		50.00				244.00
Committee total					776.00		4,728.70				5,504.70

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

WILLIAM JEFF KAHRIS, Feb. 4, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. DANIEL F. SCANDLING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 2 AND JAN. 10, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Daniel F. Scandling		1/2	USA				8,394				8,394
		1/3	London		334						334
		1/4	Pakistan		450						450
		1/6	Afghanistan		252						252
		1/7	Pakistan		524						524
		1/10	USA								
					³ - 200						- 200
Committee Total					1,360		8,394				9,754

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Unused per diem returned to U.S. Treasury.

DANIEL F. SCANDLING, Feb. 10, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. FRANK R. WOLF, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 2 AND JAN 10, 2002

Name of Member or Employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Rep. Frank R. Wolf	1/3	1/10	England, Pakistan, Afghanistan		1,226.00		8,394.08				9,620.00
					- 511.00						- 511.00
Committee total					715.00		8,394.08				9,109.08

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Unused per diem returned to U.S. Treasury.

FRANK R. WOLF, Mar. 29, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. RICHARD A CARNE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 2 AND JAN. 11, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Richard A. Carne	1/3	1/11	England, Pakistan, Afghanistan, U.A.E.		2,200.00		8,359.78				10,559.78
Committee total					2,200.00		8,359.78				10,559.78

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RICK CARNE, Jan. 30, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. XENIA HORCZAKIWSKYJ, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 13 AND JAN. 16, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Xenia Horczakowskyj	1/13	1/16	Russia		1,050.00		5,148.22				6,198.22
Committee total					1,050.00		5,148.22				6,198.22

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

XENIA HORCZAKIWSKYJ, Feb. 14, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. DAMON NELSON, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED ON FEB. 18, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES											

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAMON NELSON, Mar. 14, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVEAGA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 15 AND FEB. 21, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	2/16	2/21	New Zealand	1,920.00	804.00		5,405.60				6,209.60
	2/21	2/21	Apia, WS				45.00				45.00
Committee total					804.00		5,450.60				6,254.60

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ENI FALEOMAVEAGA, Mar. 27, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. ALAN M. HANTMAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 15 AND FEB. 22, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Alan M. Hantman	2/15	2/16	Belarus		226.91						226.91
	2/16	2/20	Russia		1,720.00						1,720.00
	2/21	2/22	Germany		398.00						398.00
Committee total					2,344.91						2,344.91

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALAN M. HANTMAN, Mar. 19, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. JOHN CUSEY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 21 AND MAR. 25, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
John Cusey	3/21	3/25	Peru		641.15		5,419				6,060.15
Committee total					641.15		5,419				6,060.15

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN CUSEY, Apr. 30, 2002.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6779. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Electronic Commerce; Disclosure to Shareholders (RIN: 3052-AC02) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6780. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's proposed bill entitled, "Repeal of Various Reports Required by the Department of Defense"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6781. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Eighty-Eighth Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System covering operations during calendar year 2001, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 247; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6782. A letter from the Director (FinCEN), Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Anti-Money Laundering Programs for Mutual Funds (RIN: 1506-AA28) received April 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6783. A letter from the Deputy Legal Counsel, CDFI Fund, Treasury, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Notice or Funds Availability (NOFA) Inviting Applications for the First Accounts Program—received April 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6784. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commission, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final report on the Portfolio Reengineering Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6785. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Energy Information Administration's "International Energy Outlook 2002," pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790f(a)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6786. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Performance Improvement 2002: Evaluation Activities of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6787. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Control of Red Phosphorus, White Phosphorus and Hypophosphorous Acid (and its salts) as List I Chemicals [DEA Number 1 98F1] (RIN: 1117-AA57) received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6788. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Final Report entitled, "Ejection Mitigation Using Advanced Glazing"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6789. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Effects of the Alternative Motor Fuels Act CAFE Incentives Policy"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6790. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Motor Vehicle Safety; Prohibitions on Sale or Lease of Defective and Noncomplaint Motor Vehicles and Items of Motor Vehicle Equipment [Docket No. NHTSA-2002-12111] (RIN: 2127-AI30) received April 25, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6791. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans South Carolina: Approval of Revisions to the 1-Hour Ozone Maintenance State Implementation Plan for the Cherokee County [SC-039; 043-200222(a); FRL-7202-4] received April 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6792. A letter from the Director of Governmental Affairs, Commission on International Religious Freedom, transmitting the Commission's Report on Sudan, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6433 Public Law 105-292 section 203; to the Committee on International Relations.

6793. A letter from the Chair, Commission on International Religious Freedom, transmitting the Commission's 2002 Annual Report, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6412 Public Law 105-292 section 102; to the Committee on International Relations.

6794. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that the Department's annual report on international terrorism, Patterns of Global Terrorism: 2001, scheduled for transmission on April 30, will be delayed this year; to the Committee on International Relations.

6795. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's semiannual report in compliance with the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2001 through September 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6796. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the FY 2001 report pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6797. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Accountability Report for FY 2001; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6798. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the

President, transmitting the FY 2003 Performance Plan and FY 2001 Annual Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6799. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Annual Program Performance Report for FY 2001; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6800. A letter from the Office of White House Liaison, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6801. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel and Designated Reporting Official, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6802. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—NOAA Ocean Exploration Initiative [Docket No. 010813205-2043-02] (RIN: 0648-XA74) received April 25, 2002A, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6803. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Financial Assistance for Environmental Education Projects in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed [Docket No. 020314059-2059-01; I.D. 022602B] (RIN: 0648-ZB16) received April 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6804. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2000 Annual Report of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6805. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Debt Collection Procedures (RIN: 3150-AG80) received May 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6806. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Bus Emergency Exits and Window Retention and Release [DOT Docket No. NHTSA-99-5157] (RIN: 2127-AH03) received April 25, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6807. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of the Santa Ana Class C Airspace Area; CA [Docket No. FAA-2001-10432; Airspace Docket No. 01-AWA-05] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6808. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation,

transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace: Elkton, MD [Airspace Docket No. 01-AEA-27] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6809. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision to Class E Surface Area at Marysville Yuba County Airport, CA [Airspace Docket No. 01-AWP-22] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6810. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Caruthersville, MO [Airspace Docket No. 02-ACE-3] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6811. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of VOR Federal Airway 105 and Jet Route 86, AZ; and the Establishment of Jet Routes 614 and 616 [Docket No. FAA-2001-9559; Airspace Docket No. 01-AWP-02] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6812. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fairchild Aircraft, Inc. Models SA226 and SA227 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-CE-47-AD; Amendment 39-12709; AD 2002-08-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6813. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; EWT 4 Heliport, Honey Grove, PA [Airspace Docket No. 01-AEA-25] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6814. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fairchild Aircraft, Inc. SA226 and SA227 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-CE-17-AD; Amendment 39-12708; AD 2002-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6815. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-400, -401, and -402 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-35-AD; Amendment 39-12713; AD 2002-08-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6816. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-38-AD; Amendment 39-12714; AD 2002-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6817. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200, -300, and -300F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-189-AD; Amendment 39-12715; AD 2002-08-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30,

2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6818. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2, A300 B4, A300 B4-600, and A300 B4-600R Series Airplanes; and Model A300 F4-605R Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-86-AD; Amendment 39-12699; AD 2002-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6819. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-196-AD; Amendment 39-12702; AD 2002-07-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6820. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727, 727C, 727-100, 727-100C, 727-200, and 727-200F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-105-AD; Amendment 39-12703; AD 2002-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6821. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-73-AD; Amendment 39-12704; AD 2002-07-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6822. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-200 and -200C Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-74-AD; Amendment 39-12705; AD 2002-07-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6823. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT9D-TR4 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2001-NE-16-AD; Amendment 39-12698; AD 2002-07-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6824. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777-200 Series Airplanes Equipped With General Electric GE90 Series Engines [Docket No. 2002-NM-30-AD; Amendment 39-12701; AD 2002-07-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6825. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, and -50 Series Airplanes; and C-9 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-324-AD; Amendments 39-12700; AD 2002-07-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6826. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division, Department of the Treasury, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule—Elimination of Application to Remove Tobacco Products from Manufacturer's Premises for Experimental Purposes [T.D. ATF-478; Re: Notice No. 931] (RIN: 1512-AC32) received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6827. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Research and Development, Competitive Merit Review Selection and Performance Measurement Evaluation pursuant to Section 5108 of the Transportation Equity Act for the Twenty-First Century (Pub. Law 105-178); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Science.

6828. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, transmitting the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2001, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. Justice Undone: Clemency Decisions in the Clinton White House (Rept. 107-454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1370. A bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide for maintenance and repair of buildings and properties located on lands in the National Wildlife Refuge System by lessees of such facilities, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 107-455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2643. A bill to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for inclusion in the Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to accelerate the marriage penalty relief in the standard deduction and to modify the work opportunity credit and the welfare-to-work credit; with an amendment (Rept. 107-457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2624. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to honor, through permanent tributes, men and women of the United States who were killed or disabled while serving as law enforcement or public safety officers (Rept. 107-458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3892. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to make certain modifications in the judicial discipline procedures, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-459). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAUZIN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4584. A bill to amend title

XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the authorization of transitional medical assistance for 1 year (Rept. 107-461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAUZIN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4584. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the abstinence education funding under maternal and child health program through fiscal year 2007 (Rept. 107-462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Education and the Workforce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4090 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4090. A bill to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and for other purposes, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce for a period ending not later than May 14, 2002, for con-

sideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(e), rule X (Rept. 107-460 Pt. 1).

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

236. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 97 memorializing the United States Congress to honor Commodore John Barry as the first flag officer of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

237. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 10 memorializing the United States Congress and the Department of Labor to relax the federal requirements on the use of federal funds for job training and employment programs such as the Dislocated Worker Program to enable the State to address its unique employment concerns in an effective manner; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

238. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 155 memorializing the United States Congress that locating a large housing development within the boundaries of the Valley Forge National Historic Park is against the spirit of the original conveyance to the Federal Government approved by the Commonwealth; to the Committee on Resources.

239. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 9 memorializing the United States Congress to pass legislation to provide loan assistance to small businesses; to the Committee on Small Business.

240. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 13 memorializing the United States Congress to pass legislation allowing for the deduction of all travel expenses from federal income taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

241. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 11 memorializing the United States Congress to introduce or support legislation for the provision of emergency medical assistance for those workers displaced as a result of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

56. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 21 petitioning the United States Congress to authorize the County of Rockland to call for the immediate closure of the Indian Point nuclear facility until safety studies are completed and adequate security measures are taken; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

NOTICE

*Incomplete record of House proceedings.
Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.*